



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

THE
AMERICAN
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

CONDUCTED
BY ABSALOM PETERS, D. D.

VOLUME ELEVENTH—NUMBERS XXIX, XXX.

NEW YORK:
GOULD & NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS AND PRINTERS.
BOSTON:

PERKINS & MARVIN AND CROCKER & BREWSTER.

1838.



CONTENTS OF VOL. XI.

NO. XXIX.

	Page.		Page.
ART. I. THE HISTORICAL AND GEOLOGICAL DELUGES COMPARED. By Prof. Hitchcock,	1	ART. VIII. PUBLIC LIBRARIES. By Prof. R. B. Patton, .	174
ART. II. THE UTILITY OF THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS TO THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS. By J. Packard,	28	ART. IX. DESIGN OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES. By Prof. L. P. Hickok,	187
ART. III. LITERARY IMPOSTURES. By D. Fosdick, Jr. . . .	39	ART. X. ON THE INFREQUENCY OF THE ALLUSIONS TO CHRISTIANITY IN GREEK AND ROMAN WRITERS. Translated from the Latin of H. T. Tschirner, by Prof. H. B. Hackett,	203
ART. IV. THE ADVANCEMENT OF BIBLICAL KNOWLEDGE. By Prof. E. P. Barrows, . . .	60	ART. XI. CONNECTION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. Translated from the German of Prof. Twisten, of Berlin, by Prof. B. B. Edwards, . . .	232
ART. V. ON THE NATURE OF INSTINCT. By Samuel Fish, M. D. Boston,	74	ART. XII. CRITICAL NOTICES, 245.	
ART. VI. FRATERNAL APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN CHURCHES, TOGETHER WITH A PLAN FOR CATHOLIC UNION ON APOSTOLIC PRINCIPLES. By Prof. S. S. Schmucker,	86	1. Union Bible Dictionary, 245	
ART. VII. THE HEBREW TENSES. Translation of Ewald, with remarks, by M. Stuart, 131		2. Works of Henry Hallam, 247	
Syntax of the Verb,	134	3. James's Christian Professor, 253	
Of the two Modes with Vav relative or conversive, the two relative historic forms, . . .	137	4. Outlines of a History of the Court of Rome,	254
Vav relative with the second Mode,	137	5. Wayland's Political Economy, abridged,	257
Vav relative with the first Mode, 141		6. Principles of Interpreting the Prophecies,	257
Participle or relative Tense, . 143		7. Works of Joseph Addison, 257	
Remarks, by the Translator, . 146		8. The Young Disciple,	259
		9. Religious Dissensions,	259
		10. Noyes's Hebrew Prophets, 260	
		11. The Family Preacher,	261
		12. A Mother's Request,	261
		ART. XIII. SELECT LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE,	262

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XI.

NO. XXX.

	Page.		Page.
ART. I. THE EVIDENCES OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS, BY ANDREWS NORTON. Vol. I. Reviewed by M. Stuart	265	THE ACTIVE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST? By Rev. R. W. Landis, Jeffersonville, Pa.	448
ART. II. THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH, HEAD OVER ALL THINGS; ILLUSTRATED BY ANALOGIES BETWEEN NATURE, PROVIDENCE, AND GRACE. By Prof. W. S. Tyler, Amherst College,	344	Introduction,	448
ART. III. FRATERNAL APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN CHURCHES, TOGETHER WITH A PLAN FOR CATHOLIC UNION ON APOSTOLIC PRINCIPLES. Concluded from p. 131. By Prof. S. S. Schmucker,	363	§ I. Views entertained by the Reformers on the doctrine of Justification,	453
The Apostolic Protestant Confession,	408	ART. VI. HEBREW LEXICOGRAPHY. Review of J. H. R. Biesenthal's "Hebräisches und chaldäisches Schulwörterbuch über das alte Testament"—and Prof. W. L. Roy's "Complete Hebrew and English Critical and Pronouncing Dictionary, on a New and Improved Plan." By Prof. I. Nordheimer.	482
I. The Apostles' Creed,	409	ART. VII. CRITICAL NOTICES,	503
II. The United Protestant Confession,	409	1. Day on the Will,	503
Mode of Operation,	414	2. Sin against the Holy Ghost,	506
ART. IV. CAUSES OF THE DENIAL OF THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH. Translated from the German of Prof. Hengstenberg of Berlin, by Rev. E. Ballantine,	416	3. Schmucker on the Reformation,	507
Introductory Notice,	416	4. A New Tribute to the Memory of J. B. Taylor,	508
Shallow and Skeptical Interpretation,	418	5. Steedman's South Africa,	509
Historical Skepticism,	435	6. Anglo-Saxon Dictionary,	509
Judgment of late Historians,	440	7. Letters from the W. Indies,	512
ART. V. WHAT WERE THE VIEWS ENTERTAINED BY THE EARLY REFORMERS ON THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION, FAITH, AND		8. Works of Charles Lamb,	512
		9. Wayland on Responsibility,	513
		10. Works of William Cowper,	514
		11. Palfrey on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities,	515
		12. Prof. Stowe's Report on Education in Europe,	517
		13. Ferdinand and Isabella,	518
		14. Antiquitates Americanae,	520
		15. Foreign Standard Literature,	519
		ART. VIII. SELECT LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE,	522

THE
AMERICAN
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

NO. XXIX.

JANUARY, 1838.

ARTICLE I

THE HISTORICAL AND GEOLOGICAL DELUGES COMPARED.

By Edward Hitchcock, Prof. of Chem. and Nat. Hist. Amherst College.
[Concluded from p. 374. Vol. X.]

THERE is one other branch of the argument for a deluge from diluvial phenomena, which we must not pass in entire silence. It is derived from an examination of the contents of certain caverns and fissures. We can, however, give but a very brief view of it; although to make it well understood, requires a volume. And happily that volume has been written. We refer to Dr. Buckland's *Reliquiae Diluvianae*.*

* In the Repository for January 1837, we expressed doubts as to what were the real opinions of Dr. Buckland at present respecting the geological evidence of a deluge; or rather, how far his opinions, as given in his *Reliquiae*, had been modified. On receiving his *Bridge-water Treatise*, we found that he had not abandoned the opinion that there has been a recent inundation of the earth, as shown by geology: but he doubts whether its identity with the Noachian deluge can be made out. The following are his views — "The evidence which I have collected in my *Reliquiae Diluvianae*, 1823, shows that one of the last great physical events that have affected the surface of our globe was a violent inundation which overwhelmed a great part of the northern hemisphere, and that this event was followed by the sudden disappearance of a large number of the species of terrestrial quadru-

In 1821, the attention of Dr. Buckland was called to the contents of a cavern in limestone, in Yorkshire, that had recently been opened and found to contain numerous peculiar bones. He found this cavern to contain on its floor the following substances. At the bottom was a coating of stalagmite, or concretioned limestone, that had dripped from the roof; then succeeded a layer of mud, which contained, as did also the stalagmite beneath it, numerous fragments of the bones of animals, most of them extinct. Above the mud was a second layer of stalagmite, destitute of bones; and the cavern appeared to have been closed since the period when the mud was introduced; the lower stalagmite having been deposited previous to that time, and the upper stalagmite subsequently. More than twenty species of animals were made out from these relics; and they were mostly tropical animals. From all the facts in the case, which were examined with great care by Prof. Buckland, he made several very important inferences: First, that this cave

peda, which had inhabited these regions in the period immediately preceding it. I also ventured to apply the name *Diluvium*, to the superficial beds of gravel, clay and sand which appear to have been produced by this great irruption of water. The description of the facts that form the evidence presented in this volume, is kept distinct from the question of the identity of the event attested by them, with any deluge recorded in history. Discoveries which have been made, since the publication of this work, show that many of the animals therein described, existed during more than one geological period preceding the catastrophe by which they were extirpated. Hence it seems more probable, that the event in question was the last of the many geological revolutions that have been produced by violent irruptions of water, rather than the comparatively tranquil inundation described in the Inspired Narrative. It has been justly argued, against the attempt to identify these two great historical and natural phenomena, that as the rise and fall of the waters of the Mosaic deluge are described to have been gradual, and of short duration, they would have produced comparatively little change on the surface of the country they overflowed. The large preponderance of extinct species among the animals we find in caves, and in superficial deposits of diluvium, and the new discovery of human bones along with them afford other strong reasons for referring these species to a period anterior to the creation of man. This important point however cannot be considered as completely settled, till more detailed investigations of the newest members of the Pliocene, and of the diluvial and alluvial formations shall have taken place." *Bridgewater Treatise*, p. 94, Note. London, 1836.

for a long time previous to the bringing in of the layer of mud, was the abode of hyenas, which dragged in thither the bones of other animals for their food. Secondly, that the mud was introduced by some general flood, and not by local inundations. Thirdly, that since the introduction of the mud, a considerably long period must have elapsed during which the upper layer of stalagmite was formed. Fourthly, that numerous tropical animals inhabited England at the period immediately preceding this inundation. Fifthly, that these became extinct at that time. By examining other similar caves and fissures in England and on the continent, he was able to add, Sixthly, that the period of the introduction of the mud corresponded with the epoch at which diluvium was deposited all over the world; and, Seventhly, that man did not probably exist in Europe previous to that period; since none of his remains have been found there in diluvium; though more recently some of the French geologists have maintained that human remains occur in such circumstances as to indicate that man must have been contemporary with elephants, hyenas, etc. But Dr. Buckland, in his recent *Bridgewater Treatise*, still maintains that "no conclusion is more fully established than the important fact of the total absence of any vestiges of the human species throughout the entire series of geological formations."* Finally, it was inferred from the facts respecting the caverns and fissures, that the sea and land did not change places at the last deluge; that is, the antediluvian continents did not then sink down, and the post-diluvian continents rise, as has been frequently imagined.

These conclusions, we are aware, have been assailed from all quarters; and we observe that not many geological writers seem now disposed to admit them in their full extent. Perhaps, indeed, Dr. Buckland made some inferences which the facts more thoroughly understood will not justify. And he also attempted to identify the deluge that filled the caverns and fissures with that of Noah; a point which he has himself since abandoned. But viewing the facts as indicative of a deluge, and not of the Mosaic deluge, we have never seen any refutation of the general conclusions that we have stated above. Indeed, they correspond well with similar facts taught by other parts of geology, and a presumption is thereby created in favor of their truth. Taken independently of the other phenomena of diluvium,

* *Bridgewater Treatise*, Vol. I. p. 103. London, 1836.

which we have detailed, we doubt whether this antediluvian charnel house could have given us so clear an insight into the early history of our globe. Nor has Dr. Buckland attempted to separate the two classes of phenomena ; and until we meet with stronger objections than any we have yet seen, we must regard his history of the contents of caves and fissures as an interesting branch of diluvial agency on the globe.

We have thus endeavored to present a somewhat extended view of the argument furnished by geology, and derived chiefly from our own country in proof of an extensive if not universal deluge in comparatively modern times. We freely confess that we cannot explain the phenomena in any other way, than by admitting the occurrence of such a catastrophe. But we have no disposition to be dogmatical on the subject ; and we have endeavored to show that the denial of any such deluge does not bring us at all into collision with the inspired history. But admitting such a deluge, is it, or is it not identical with that described by Moses? On this point we shall be still less disposed to dogmatize. Yet we will present our readers with the arguments in favor of their identity, as well as with those opposed to it.

In the first place, the deluges of geology and of Scripture agree in being comparatively recent. We know the date of the latter ; but though geology has left on imperishable monuments the traces of many distinct epochs, it tells us of few chronological dates. Hence we can only compare the diluvial epoch with those that preceded it. And with the exception of the modern epoch, that is the commencement of the deposition of alluvium, the time when diluvium was deposited was the last of these epochs. It might indeed have been earlier than the date of Noah's deluge : yet we have in another place presented arguments to prove that it could not have been excessively remote. And until it can be proved that it was more remote than the flood described by Moses, why should he give it a gratuitous antiquity that we might not identify it with the latter? True philosophy, it seems to us, ought to regard them as synchronous until very strong evidence be presented to the contrary.

Secondly, the two deluges agree together in being of great extent. We do not say, in being universal, because it may be doubted and often has been, in regard to each of them, whether they were so. We think we have shown that the geological deluge extended over a large part of the northern hemisphere :

but the tropical and southern parts of the globe have not had their diluvial phenomena examined with care enough to enable us to decide whether this deluge extended so far. Yet from the powerful waves produced at a great distance by earthquakes beneath the ocean, it is difficult to conceive how a torrent of water should rush over the northern hemisphere, or even over the northern parts of America, without inundating by its direct or reflex action all other parts of the globe. We prefer, however, to speak of the last geological deluge as being extensive, rather than universal, until direct evidence be furnished of its being coëxtensive with the globe.

As to the extent of the Noachian deluge, the language of Scripture seems at first view to be very decided: *And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered.* Alike universal are the terms employed repeatedly to denote the destruction of animals upon the earth: *And behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth shall die.* In spite of these strong expressions, not a few able writers have understood them as simply universal terms with a limited meaning. Of such cases numerous examples might be quoted in the sacred records. Thus, in Gen. 41: 57, it is said, that *all countries came into Egypt to Joseph to buy corn, because that the famine was sore in all lands.* Here we have reason to suppose that only the well known countries around Egypt are meant. Again, 1 Kings 10: 24: *And all the earth sought to Solomon to hear his wisdom:* that is, doubtless, his fame was very extensive, and many sought to him, but not literally the whole earth. We have also a case in point in Deut. 2: 25: *This day I will begin to put the dread of thee and the fear of thee upon the nations that are under the whole heavens, who shall hear report of thee, and shall tremble, and be in anguish because of thee.* An analogous case is that of the animals shown to Peter in vision, let down in "a certain vessel," *wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts and creeping things, and fowls of the air,* (Acts 10: 12.) Who will imagine that all the quadrupeds, reptiles, and birds on the globe, were here shown to the apostle? Is it not clear that this is an example of the principle stated by Aristotle: τὸ γὰρ πάντες εἰναι πολλοὶ κατὰ μεταφορὰν εἰρηται, "all is said metaphorically

for *many*?" We might quote here the declaration of Paul to the Colossians (Col. 1: 23) wherein he speaks of the *Gospel which was preached to every creature which is under heaven*. No one can suppose that the apostle meant that the Gospel had in that day been literally preached to every creature under heaven: for every reader must have known the contrary to be true. But it had been preached very extensively; and thus would every reader understand it; so conformable was the mode of expression to the idiom of the Bible, and indeed of all languages. "The Jews," says Michaelis, "have well observed, that כל, *all, every*, is not to be understood, on all occasions, with the mathematical sense of *all*; because, it is also used to signify many." The same is true of the Greek πᾶς, the Latin *omnis*, the English *all*, etc. Even in the description of the flood in Genesis there is one of these universal terms employed, whose meaning we are obliged to limit. It was commanded to Noah — *of every living thing of all flesh, pairs of every sort, shalt thou bring into the ark to keep them alive*. Here we must limit the term *all flesh*, to such animals as needed a shelter from the cataclysm. Most writers on the Scriptures are now willing to admit that not even pairs of all the land animals, amounting it is now well known to several hundred thousand, were collected from every part of the earth into the ark. Even Granville Penn, in his severe strictures upon geology, as he understands it, or rather as he misunderstands it, takes this ground. But the younger Rosenmüller very justly contends, that if the universality in respect to the animals saved in the ark be given up, so must the universality in respect to its extent: that is, if we may limit the terms in the one case, we may in the other.

Such has been the conclusion of many able commentators. "It is evident," says bishop Stillingfleet, "that the flood was universal as to mankind; but from thence follows no necessity at all of asserting the universality of it as to the globe of the earth, unless it be sufficiently proved that the whole earth was peopled before the flood." (Orig. Sacr. Book 3. chap. 4.) "Consentiunt quidem omnes," says Le Clerc, "diluvium universale fuisse, quatenus totum orbem habitatum oppressit, universumque humanum genus, exemptâ Noachi familiâ, eo interiit. At alii volunt totum telluris globum aquis obrutum fuisse, quod alii negant." "Non putandum est," says Poole in his Synopsis, "totum terræ globum aquis tectum fuisse.

Quid opus erat illas mergere terras, ubi homines non erant? Licet ergo credamus ne centissimam quidem orbis partem aquis fuisse obrutam, erit nihilominus diluvium universale, quia clades totum orbem oppressit." "Num diluvium totum terrarum orbem inundavit," says Dathe, "an regiones tantum eo tempore habitatas dissentiunt interpretes. Ego quidem facio cum his, qui posterioram sententiam defendunt—Vocabulum *omnis*, non probat inundationem fuisse universalem. Constet multis in locis לָבִי intelligendum esse tantum de re, sive loco de quo agitur, Cap. 2: 19, 20. Ezek. 31: 6. Igitur *omnia animalia*, in navem intromissa sunt earum regionum, quae aquis inundandae. Sic quoque de *montibus* sentiendum est, quos aquae superaverunt."*

We doubt, therefore, whether the language of Moses requires us to admit that he meant to impute an universality to the deluge coëxtensive with the earth. But if it be a fact that the ark did rest upon the summit of the present mount Ararat, in Armenia, and that the waters rose fifteen cubits above that level, we can hardly conceive it possible that so mighty a wave should not sweep over the whole globe, either in its flux or reflux. For according to the recent observations of professor Parrot, that mountain is 15,219 English feet above the ocean. There are two suggestions, however, that may throw some doubt over this conclusion. Some authors do not think it certain that the present mount Ararat is the Ararat (אַרָרָט) on which the ark rested. "The stream of interpreters," says Mr. Kirby, "ancient and modern, place this mountain in Armenia; but Shuckford, after Sir Walter Raleigh, seems to think that Ararat was further to the east and belonged to the great range anciently called Caucasus and Imaus, which terminates in the Himmaleh mountains to the north of India. This opinion seems to receive some confirmation from Scripture, for it is said, *as they journeyed from the east, they found a plain in the land of Shinar*. Now the Armenian Ararat is to the north of Babylonia, whereas the Indian is to the east."† Mr. Kirby quotes also the tradition prevalent in India that the ark was moored at first to the Himmaleh, and he considers its superior height as corresponding better than that of Ararat with the long period of ten weeks that intervened after the ark first rested, before the tops of other

* Pentateuchus a Dathio, p. 63.

† Bridgewater Treatise, p. 25. Philad. 1836.

mountains were seen. These arguments are not perhaps sufficient to outweigh the almost universal testimony of antiquity; yet they are not without weight. We venture to make another suggestion. Is it certain that the ark rested upon the highest summit of Ararat? The language of Moses does not surely teach that such was the fact; for he merely states that the ark rested upon the mountains of Ararat, or Armenia (עַל תְּהִי אֲרָרָט, Gen. 8: 4). And we might presume that the place of descent would be chosen by God in a convenient spot for reaching the plain below; whereas the summit of Ararat is so difficult of ascent, that not until A. D., 1829, did man succeed in setting his foot upon it. So that nothing but a miracle could have enabled the men and animals preserved in the ark to descend in safety. We confess that the point where the ark rested must have been very elevated, because we find it to have been ten weeks afterwards before the tops of other mountains began to appear, although the waters were continually decreasing.

If we mistake not, then, the deluges of Scripture and of geology, may, or may not, have been universal, in consistency with the language of the sacred history, and with the facts of science as they are at present understood. They agree, therefore, in having been very extensive, if not universal. And in view of such proofs of their identity, it should require decisive evidence to the contrary to disjoin them. The following are the principal objections to this identity.

1. The great preponderance of extinct species of organic beings in diluvium. Some of these species appear to have existed through several geological periods anterior to the diluvial epoch. Now it is known that the more unlike existing animals and plants are to the remains of those in a particular formation, the more ancient do we conclude that formation to be. On the same principle, the presumption is rather in favor of placing the last aqueous catastrophe which geology describes at a period earlier than man's creation.

2. No human remains are found in diluvium. If man had existed and in great numbers, there seems no reason why his remains should not occur along with those of other animals. There is no way to avoid this conclusion but by supposing the antediluvians to have been limited to central Asia, whose diluvium has been as yet little explored.

3. The period occupied by the Mosaic deluge was too short

to have produced the diluvial phenomena which geology exhibits. We confess we have been deeply impressed with this objection, when witnessing the powerful denuding effects of the the last geological cataclysm. It is not merely the vast accumulations of diluvium, nor the smoothed and furrowed aspect of the hardest rocks, that have seemed to demand more time than the year of the Noachian deluge ; but the scooping out of vallies, and that too of considerable depth, and in solid rock. True, there are distinct marks of a power and violence in the diluvian waters of which we see no examples at present in aqueous currents ; and we feel at a loss to determine how much more rapidly this unknown increase of power might have accomplished the work of denudation. We ought to recollect too, that when we look upon a valley through which a powerful current of water has rushed, we are not generally able to determine whether that current has formed the whole valley, or only given it its last form. Another circumstance, also, has struck us as indicating that even the geological deluge did not occupy an immense period. Along the rocky banks of existing rivers, we have almost always found more or less of those excavations in the rocks called *pot holes*, produced by the long continued gyratory motion of pebbles in a cavity. But distinct as are the marks of the diluvial waters, we never saw any of these peculiar excavations. And we cannot but impute their non-existence to the want of sufficient time during the cataclysm.

Upon the whole, the arguments against the identity of the two deluges appear to us rather to preponderate. "This important point, however," to use the language of Dr. Buckland, "cannot be considered as completely settled, till more detailed investigations of the newest members of the Pliocene, and of the diluvial and alluvial formations shall have taken place."* We feel no great anxiety how this question is settled, as to its bearing upon revelation. But examined in the true spirit of the Baconian philosophy, it seems to us that there is quite too much evidence of the identity of the two deluges, and quite too much ignorance of the whole subject of diluvium yet remaining, to permit an impartial geologist to decide peremptorily, as some have done, that they could not have been contemporaneous. We rather prefer that state of mind in which the judgment remains undecided, waiting for further light. Meanwhile it is

* Bridgewater Treatise, p. 95. Vol. I. London, 1836.

sufficient, so far as revelation is concerned, to have shown that no presumption is derived from geology against the truth of Moses's history of the deluge ; but rather a presumption in its favor even on the most unfavorable supposition.

3. *We now proceed, as the third general branch of our subject, to consider the most important objections derived from geology and natural history, against the truth of the Mosaic history of the deluge.*

Not many years since, it was thought by the skeptical, that civil history furnished many facts inconsistent with the recent date of the Noachian deluge. The archives and traditions of Assyria, Egypt, and China, the Hindoo astronomical tables, and the Zodiacs of Denderah and Esneh, were mustered for battle with the Bible. The shout of victory, on the part of infidelity, rung loudly before the tug of the war had come. And it was not so much Christians who stood up in defence of the Bible, as it was men, who with little regard for the Scriptures, were yet friends to fair examination. Before the magic scrutiny of such minds, the hoary aspect of these vaunted relics disappeared, and strong confirmation of the Mosaic chronology was the result. So that it is no longer necessary to go into a labored refutation of the extravagant chronologies of semi-barbarous nations, nor of their supposititious astronomical epochs.* Many of the objections to the Mosaic chronology, derived from science, also, now that the subjects are better understood, have ceased to be adduced by intelligent infidels ; but we must briefly refer to some, which, by those not thoroughly acquainted with science, are still occasionally adduced in opposition to the authority of Moses.

1. It has been thought that certain natural processes now going on, must have had an earlier commencement than the date of the Noachian deluge.

It is hardly necessary here to refer to the seven lava beds, said to exist around Mount Etna, with a rich stratum of soil, or decomposed lava, between each of them ; and each of which it was supposed must have demanded at least 2000 years for its formation and decomposition. For it now appears that the supposed decomposed surface is nothing but a ferruginous tufa,

* By far the best view of these subjects which we have seen is contained in the interesting Lectures of Dr. Wiseman on the Connection between Science and Revelation, recently republished at Andover.

which is often produced at the beginning or end of a volcanic eruption ; and, therefore, these successive beds of lava might have been produced in as many years.

The gorge or ravine, 200 feet deep and seven miles long, between Niagara Falls and Lake Ontario, has long been thought to require an immense period for its excavation ; at least 10,000 years. Admitting this to be true, we do not see how it clashes with the chronology of Moses, according to the view which most christian geologists take of the creation of the world. For why may not that excavation have commenced anterior to the deluge ; nay, before the six days of creation ? Nearly all real geologists now believe that our continents remain essentially the same as they were before the deluge ; so that antediluvian processes of excavation might have been resumed in the postdiluvian period. But there is another and probably a better mode of meeting this difficulty. Prof. Rogers, as we have seen, (p. 346, No. 28,) supposes that the trough below the falls may have been commenced by diluvial agency ; and that the waters of the lake have only modified it and are slowly extending it southerly. The fact that this trough lies in a north and south direction favors this suggestion, made as it is by a cautious and able geologist ; and whoever is familiar with diluvial phenomena, will see at once that it is extremely probable. According to this theory all calculations made from the present rate of retrocession of the falls, will give us no correct results as to the time when the process began, because we do not know at what point the abrading process began.

2. Another objection formerly urged with confidence, is, that it is mathematically impossible for the present oceans of the globe to be raised so as to cover its whole surface. This would require several additional oceans to be superimposed upon those now existing, and from whence could this immense additional quantity of water have proceeded ; or if miraculously obtained, what has become of it ?

Some have replied, by considering the whole phenomena of the flood as miraculous. And a perusal of the scriptural narrative is apt to leave the impression on the mind that such was the case. But according to the present state of geological science, there is no need of resorting to a miracle to escape from this objection. For in the first place, we have endeavored to show that there is nothing in the Scripture account of the deluge that requires us to consider it universal, except so far as man

dwelt on the globe. But secondly, the sudden elevation of a continent, or mountain chain, would raise such a wave, as in its flux and reflux, must overwhelm all the dry land, although all continents might not be submerged at the same moment. We have sometimes been almost disposed to believe that this flux and reflux of the diluvian waters is referred to in the *הִלֹךְ וַשׁוּב* of Gen. 8: 3, and the *הִלֹךְ וַחֲסֹר* of Gen. 8: 5, (*literally, in going and returning and in going and decreasing*) but we suppose that the Hebrew idiom will not allow that any thing more is included in these phrases than *a continual decrease of the waters*.

3. Some parts of the globe it is said exhibit no marks of diluvial agency. Chaubard, as already stated, (p. 351, No. 28,) declares that erratic blocks or bowlders are wanting in the Pyrenees, the Appenines, the Carpathian mountains, and the mountains of Bohemia ; and Mr. Lyell states that he did not find them in Sicily, nor in Italy, till he approached the foot of the Alps. Humboldt states, also, that there are no such fragments at the eastern foot of the equatorial Andes.* Mr. Lyell likewise represents the cones of extinct volcanoes in central France as showing no marks of erosion by water.† These facts are not, however, adduced by these writers to disprove the occurrence of such a flood as Moses describes ; but some of them at least suppose that they show that catastrophe to have been local, not universal ; or that it was too quiet to leave any permanent traces of its existence. And if we admit that the Noachian deluge was not universal, as we have endeavored to show may be done consistently with the terms of the sacred record, these statements are no objection to that history. But we may be permitted to doubt whether they throw any formidable difficulty in the way of one who contends for the universality and powerful action of the Mosaic deluge. For it is very certain that the force of diluvial currents was greatly modified by local circumstances, having been most powerful in mountainous regions, or where the waters were forced through narrow gorges. Hence it is easy to conceive, that in some regions those currents might have been so feeble, as for instance on extensive plains, as to leave few or no traces. And as to the volcanic cones of centra

* Lyell's Anniversary Address before the London Geol. Society 1836. p. 32.

† Lyell's Geology, Vol. 3. p. 273.

France, is it certain that they may not have been thrown up since the time of Noah's flood? For the earliest historical records respecting that country, do not reach back within 2000 years of that event. Or if they were antediluvian, is it certain that the diluvial currents might not have been comparatively feeble in that region?

4. The existence and preservation of the olive on mount Ararat have been regarded as other objections against the Mosaic account of the deluge. It does not now grow, it is said, in the vicinity of that mountain, certainly not near its top, which is covered with perpetual snow. It might be a sufficient reply to this difficulty, that there has been in all ages not a little diversity of opinion as to the situation of the Ararat on which the ark rested. If the opinion should prove true, that it is really a part of the Himmaleh range in India, the objection would disappear. But not to resort to this mode of avoiding the difficulty, if we regard the sacred and geological deluges as identical, we have the strongest reason to suppose that at the time of the latter, there was no small change of the temperature of northern regions. All the northern part of Asia abounds with the remains of the elephant. It is true that one of these animals, found preserved entire in ice, was covered with hair; and some have thought that this circumstance proves the animal to have been an inhabitant of a cold climate. But if it inhabited a climate as cold as the one now existing there, whence could it obtain vegetable food? The truth is, that hairy elephants are now found in the higher and cooler parts of India; and this shows us, that though the climate of Siberia when inhabited by these extinct races of elephants was colder than the present unmodified climate of the torid zone, yet it was not much colder. And hence the antediluvian climate around the present Ararat, might have been warm enough to have produced the olive. Indeed, for this purpose very little change was probably necessary; we mean in the lower parts of Armenia; since Strabo mentions that in his day one part of that country did actually produce the olive.

That a change of climate did take place at the epoch of the geological deluge, is proved very conclusively from the fact above referred to, of the discovery of an entire elephant encased in ice on the shores of the Arctic Ocean. For previous to the time in which he was enveloped in the ice, the climate must have been too warm, in order that such an animal might live,

to suppose he was frozen up during the winter so firmly as not to thaw out again during the summer. But the congelation, when it took place, was so powerful that the ice remained unmelted till the beginning of the present century. The change of climate therefore, must have been sudden and permanent. Whether the pouring down of the contents of the Arctic Ocean upon that country might have been a sufficient cause of this change, we hardly feel prepared to say. That it would produce as great a change of temperature as we suppose took place, for the time being, we doubt not. We find it difficult, however, to conceive that this cause should still continue in operation. On the whole, beset as the subject is with difficulties, we are prepared to say little more than that a change of climate did take place at the epoch of the last geological deluge; and if the deluge of Scripture be identical, this fact removes all difficulty respecting the growth of the olive in Armenia. Or, if they be not identical, what happened at one of these cataclysms, may have been repeated during the other.

It appears that during the Noachian deluge the olive tree from which the dove obtained a leaf, was neither uprooted, nor did it lose its vitality. Hence some have inferred that there could not have been much violence in the diluvian waters. But we have only to suppose that particular tree to have stood in a sheltered situation, and it might have remained unaffected though the waters raged with great fury around it. As to the "leaf plucked off," it might have been put forth after the waters had subsided; for there was an interval of more than a month and a half between the time when the ark first grounded, and when the dove was sent forth the second time. Some have supposed the olive to have been a new creation, of which we have reason to suppose there may have been many examples immediately subsequent to the deluge. But in that case, the leaf could hardly have been evidence to Noah that the earth had become so dry that vegetation had again put forth. Nor do we see any need of miraculous agency in the case, and therefore we ought not to admit it without strong proof.

5. Another objection to the Mosaic account of the deluge is, that pairs of all the animals on the globe could not have been preserved in the ark. From the days of Celsus, who in reference to this difficulty denominated the ark *κεβωτόν ἀλλόκοτον*, *the absurd ark*, to the present time, this objection has been urged as quite unanswerable. And many theologians have made

great efforts to show, by rigid calculation, that there was room abundant in that vessel for all the animals that would be liable to be destroyed by a deluge, with provisions for a year. If we regard the cubit as having been 21.8 inches, according to some writers, the length of the ark was 547 English feet, its breadth ninety-one feet, and its height fifty-five feet. But if the cubit was only a foot and a half, according to the most probable estimate, its length was 450 feet, its breadth seventy-five feet, and its height forty-five feet. Now such dimensions would perhaps be sufficient to accommodate pairs of all the animals known to naturalists in the days of Buffon; when they estimated the number of the mammalia at about 250, and made little account of other animals. But since more than a thousand quadrupeds have been described, more than 6000 birds, and more than 100,000 insects; and since it is made probable that the actual number of these classes is at least half a million;* such calculations as these have fallen into neglect, and no judicious Christian likes to rest the authority of Moses upon such uncertain estimates, if there be another mode of meeting this difficulty less objectionable. And another mode is now generally adopted, even by writers who are extremely fearful lest any violence should be done to the language of Scripture, to accommodate it to the discoveries of science. They suppose it, as we have already mentioned in considering the question as to the universality of the flood, an example where universal terms are used with a limited signification. For the command to bring into the ark *of every living thing of all flesh, pairs of every sort*, must, at any rate, be limited to those animals that live out of water; and there would seem to be no reason why a still further limitation of the language is not allowable if there be sufficient reason for it. Now we cannot but believe that the impossibility, without a constant miracle, of collecting and preserving all animals from every part of the world in the ark, as well as the entire uselessness of doing this, so far as we can see, together with the difficulties resulting from the facts concerning their present distribution over the earth, (a subject which we shall shortly consider,) do form a sufficient reason for limiting the language of Moses to those animals most common and important in the country where the ark was constructed; or rather to a sufficient number of animals to form an impressive memorial to the post-

* *Foreign Quarterly Review* for April, 1835, p. 90.

diluvians of so great a catastrophe, and probably also to furnish them at once, without a miracle, with the necessary domestic animals. The case seems very analogous to the naming of animals by Adam, when it is said that *Adam gave names to all cattle and to the fowl of the air*. But few commentators we believe will contend that this is to be understood as zoologically true. We are not prepared to say that the ark might not have been large enough to have contained pairs of all the animals that live out of water; but to collect them and take care of them and afterwards to distribute them over the face of the earth must have been altogether miraculous, and as we do not see of what use such a miracle could have been, and we know that God does not put forth a miraculous agency where the object can be accomplished by his ordinary operations, we rather prefer the explanation that supposes universal terms to have been employed with a limited meaning; and that only a part of the species of animals that then existed were preserved in the ark. As we do not thus violate the principles of interpretation, and as this exegesis perfectly satisfies the objection, it seems to us more satisfactory than any other.

6. Finally, it is said that the present distribution of animals on the globe is incompatible with the idea that they ever spread or migrated from any one point on its surface, as they must have done if all proceeded from those preserved in the ark. This is the most important and plausible objection we have considered; and in order fully to appreciate its force, we must date the general principles by which the distribution of plants and animals on the globe has been regulated;—a subject, which, until recently, even the ablest naturalists did not understand; and concerning which, we apprehend that very vague notions now prevail among the great mass of intelligent men who are not naturalists.

In the first place, a considerable number of species, both of animals and plants, are capable of enduring great varieties of climate, and have in fact migrated over a considerable part of the globe. Most of the domestic animals, such as the ox, the horse, the dog, and the cat, are of this description; being found in every climate. But some, such as the camel and the elephant, are confined to the warmer parts of the earth. Some plants also accompany man wherever he goes. The plantain, for instance (*Plantago major* L.) followed the track of the first settlers of this country so uniformly, as to be denominated by

Indians, "English man's foot." It is only a few years since the flea bane (*Erigeron Canadense* L.) was first carried to Europe, and it is now spread over France, Great Britain, Italy, Sicily, Holland, and Germany. The thorn apple (*Datura Stramonium* L.) originally brought from the East Indies and Abyssinia, now grows as a common weed over nearly every part of Europe and the United States. The seeds of some plants are fitted to sail on the water, and in this way are driven from continent to continent. Others have hooks attached to them, so that they may cling to the hairy coats of animals and be thus dispersed.

To this migratory class of organized beings, man belongs. It is easy to conceive how he might have originated in a particular spot, and in the course of a few ages have been spread over the globe, as we now find him to be. We are not aware that any of those naturalists who believe the varieties of men to constitute different species, created in the regions they now occupy, deny at all the possibility of distribution from one point; but they found their opinion upon other considerations.

But in the second place, the greater part of animals and plants are confined to particular districts of the globe; so that the earth is divided into a large number of distinct zoölogical and botanical provinces, each one of which is distinguished by several peculiar species. The most distinct of these provinces are separated by wide oceans, or are situated in different zones; but sometimes a range of mountains merely forms the dividing line. The difference between the plants and animals of the several zones on the globe, has long been well known; and it may be supposed that all the peculiarity of any particular zoölogical or botanical province depends upon the latitude. But this is not the fact; for the productions of countries on different continents, between the same isothermal lines, do not correspond; certainly not as to species. Thus, of the 2891 species of plants described by Pursh in the United States, only 385 occur in the temperate parts of Europe. New Holland is remarkable for the peculiarity of its Fauna and Flora; the plants and animals found there being almost without exception different from those in other parts of the world. So the animals of America are strikingly different from those of the eastern continent. The number of zoölogical provinces on the globe has been estimated at eleven, and the Decandolles, father and son, than whom no better judges can be named, reckon the number of distinct bo-

tanical provinces at twenty-seven. This estimate was the result of an examination of seventy or eighty thousand species.

In the early days of natural history, travellers expected to find the same animals and plants in distant countries as in their own ; and often they fancied resemblances where later observations have shown only a sort of family likeness, but not a specific identity. Even Linnaeus maintained that all the species of animals and plants were originally placed on one fertile spot from whence they subsequently migrated, so as to fill the earth. But the facts of the case were then too imperfectly known to enable even the strongest and most impartial mind to arrive at a correct conclusion. Naturalists now almost universally suppose that each species was indigenous to one particular spot and that different species were placed in different spots, from whence they have spread to a greater or less distance. So that when they find a species on almost every part of the globe they immediately begin to seek out its birth place and the means of its dispersion.

From these facts we trust our readers will be able to estimate the force of the objection under consideration. If all animals on the face of the globe were destroyed by the deluge, except those preserved in the ark, then the existing races must have migrated from the region of Ararat to their present stations in the remotest parts of the globe. But facts show that with few exceptions they are confined to particular regions ; and when we find the same animal in distant spots, we also find it in intermediate places. If all proceeded from one point after the deluge, we should have expected to find traces of their existence along the path of their migration. Again, if this dispersion took place naturally, how could species adapted, as we now see the greater part are, to a particular climate, have been sustained while they were gradually moving through regions unpropitious to them, to that spot for which Providence intended them? By what instinct could they have been guided to countries oft several thousand miles distant? And especially, how could the tropical animals of America have reached their present abode without passing through the Arctic regions around Behring Strait, where such animals could not now survive a week? And there are many other cases where the difficulty of transportation must have been equally great.

To reconcile this objection with the history of Noah's deluge as it is usually understood, is, indeed, no easy task ; that is,

we suppose pairs of all animals on the globe were actually preserved in the ark and the deluge was strictly universal. Some, we know, will cut the knot at once, by imputing the whole to the miraculous power of God — and we readily admit that this was sufficient if exerted — but we do not think it necessary to resort to such an agency in order to vindicate the Scriptures : and as a resort to miracles rarely satisfies, although it may silence skeptical minds, we shall suggest two hypotheses which we regard sufficient to meet the difficulty.

In the first place, the deluge may not have been universal. We have already endeavored to show that the *כִּלְיֵי-הָאָרֶץ* (Gen. 8: 9) over which the waters are said to have flowed, may have been equivalent to the *οἰκουμένη* of the New Testament ; that is, the whole world so far as men inhabited it. And if this be admitted, the animals that existed in remote countries may not have perished ; while those saved in the ark furnished the stock for repopling the regions which the flood had destroyed. Such an interpretation has had its advocates, ever since the days of Quirini, in 1676 ; and we are confident that it may be maintained without straining or perverting the sacred record at all ; though we feel some difficulty with it on geological grounds : that is, we can hardly see why a deluge extensive enough to overwhelm the *οἰκουμένη*, should not sweep over other parts of the world.

In the second place, a new creation of animals and plants may have taken place subsequent to the deluge. We admit that the Scriptures are silent on the subject, and therefore they leave us free to reason concerning it from philosophical considerations. If it be admitted that the language of Scripture respecting the deluge is to be limited to the region, probably not extensive, which was occupied by man, and to the animals with which he was most familiar in those regions, we should not expect, that in giving an account of what took place after the deluge, they would describe the animals and plants of other parts of the world, even if they were then first created : For in this case, it would have been necessary to communicate a knowledge of the geography of the globe ; or in other words, to anticipate future discoveries in that science. And this would have been foreign to the object of revelation, as indeed would any account be of the animals and plants of remote regions, or of organic remains in the rocks. It ought also to be recollected, that the sacred writers use almost the same language to describe

the original creation of the matter of the universe, as the successive production of animals and plants by ordinary generation ; since they looked upon both as equally the work of God. A passage in the 104th Psalm will illustrate this idea, (vs. 29, 30) : *Thou hidest thy face, they (animals of every kind) are troubled : thou takest away their breath, they die and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created : and thou renewest the face of the earth.* Now we cannot but see the resemblance between this description and that of the original creation in Genesis. The same Spirit is concerned and the same word used, viz. *נִפְחָה*. It very well describes, also, those successive destructions and renewals of animal races, which geologists maintain are shown by the history of organic remains, to have taken place on the globe. Yet commentators generally suppose that this passage describes only the ordinary destruction and renewal of the animal races, which is daily taking place by what are called natural laws.

The inference we wish to make from such facts as these, is, that even though new species of organized beings were from time to time created, it would not be strange that it should not be noticed in the Scriptures, if the mention of it did not fall in directly with the great moral object of the Bible ; since the inspired writers would not regard such an exercise of Divine power as scarcely more illustrative of the perfections of Jehovah, than the ordinary and continual reproduction of animals and plants.

Suppose now, that naturalists should find reason to conclude that new species of animals and plants do occasionally appear on the globe ; would there be any inconsistency between such a fact and the Scriptures ? Must we believe that the creation of all animals and plants, that ever have existed, is described in the Bible ? We think it almost certain, as we have shown in another place, (Bibl. Repos. Vol. VI. p. 309,) that the animals and plants found fossil are not described in Genesis. And naturalists think that there are some cases in which a new species of animal is introduced in modern times ; as in those instances where animals or animalculæ are found only in some substance that has been discovered by a chemical process in modern times.* We do not regard the examples which they cite as entirely satisfactory : But the enormous multiplication of the

* Blumenbach's Manual of Natural History, p. 276. London, 1825.

frogs of Egypt, sometimes mentioned by commentators as an example of a new creation, seems explicable by natural laws but with great difficulty. And such examples, in connection with our previous reasoning, go to take away all improbability from the conclusion, that there was a new creation immediately subsequent to the deluge.

Evidence is derived from geology that several catastrophes, which have in early times taken place on the globe, by which entire races of organized beings have been destroyed, have been followed by the creation of new races. Sometimes a few species seem to have survived the catastrophe, or have been reproduced ; but in general, those created after the catastrophe have been different from those destroyed by it. Here then, it seems to us, we obtain a still stronger presumption that the diluvial catastrophe described by Moses was followed by an analogous new creation, so far as it was necessary to repeople the world, or to adapt organized beings to changes in climate and other circumstances. The numerous examples of new creations which Palaeontology furnishes, show us that such is the law of the Divine administration.

Another consideration renders still more probable the idea of a new creation subsequent to the deluge. It does not appear from the sacred records, that any provision was made in the ark for the preservation of plants or seeds. Now there are very many species that would have been entirely destroyed by being covered with water for a year ; as will be evident to any one who has noticed how a flood of a few weeks will ruin many plants on which the water rests. They cannot survive so long without the access of air. The diluvial waters, therefore, must have destroyed the germinating principle in numerous instances ; and unless the postdiluvian flora be more scanty than the antediluvian, as we have no reason to suppose, — these last species must have been recreated after the waters had retired.

These several circumstances do not prove certainly that such a creation did take place. But when we connect them with the facts that have been detailed, respecting the present distribution of organized beings, which are totally at variance with their having spread except miraculously from one point, and when we consider further, that the Scriptures leave us at entire liberty to suppose such a creation, the hypothesis certainly appears probable enough to form a satisfactory reply to the objection under consideration against the scriptural account de-

♦

rived from the present distribution of organized beings. Some, however, have thought that it would be still more satisfactory to combine both the hypotheses which we have named. They would admit a new creation, and also suppose that the deluge was not universal. We do not feel anxious which of the three modes of relieving the difficulty is adopted. But on them at least seems to us indispensable.

4. *It only remains, as the fourth general branch of our subject, to inquire whether any natural causes could have produced the deluge.*

It is well known, that from the earliest times, writers have indulged in speculations on the natural causes of this event; while to many, such an inquiry seems almost sacrilegious; since they suppose the deluge to have been strictly miraculous. Had the sacred writers distinctly informed us that such was the fact, all philosophical reasoning concerning that event would have been presumptuous and useless. But since the Bible is silent on this point, and since we know it to be a general principle in God's government, not to superadd to natural agencies a miraculous energy where the former is sufficient to accomplish his purposes, we are surely at liberty to inquire whether any forces exist in nature sufficient, by their unaided operation, to produce such a catastrophe. In giving a history of opinions respecting the deluge, we have exhibited a variety of hypotheses on this subject; but most of them are too evidently baseless to need a formal examination. We shall therefore mention only those that are still advanced by respectable writers of the present day.

1. Some impute the deluge to the approximation of a comet to the earth, or to an actual appulse of the two bodies. On this hypothesis it is not necessary to add any thing to what we have stated in giving the history of opinions concerning the deluge, (Bibl. Repos. Jan. 1837. p. 107.) The fact, now well ascertained, that the comets are not solid bodies, and for the most part are only very attenuated vapor, certainly renders this hypothesis entirely untenable. And we can explain the circumstance that some writers still cling to it, only by supposing them ignorant of the facts, or strangely perverted in their judgments by the influence of hypothesis.

2. Some suppose that the deluge was caused by the sinking down of the antediluvian continents beneath the ocean, and the elevation of our present continents above the waters. Such an event would, indeed, produce a complete and universal deluge;

and a certain class of writers, as we have seen in a former number of this work, (Bibl. Repos. Jan. 1837. p. 108,) maintain this theory with great confidence. They are writers who are greatly scandalized by the efforts of geologists to show that a long interval may have elapsed, undescribed, between the 'beginning' and the six days of creation, lest too great latitude of interpretation should thus be allowed in biblical exegesis. And yet this hypothesis of theirs requires them to admit, contrary to what every child sees to be the truth in reading the Bible, that the waters of the flood did not first rise over the land and then subside, leaving the same land dry ; but that the land sunk down, which brought over it the ocean, and that other continents rose in other parts of the globe to form new habitations for organized beings. Hence they must further admit, that there must at that time have been an entirely new creation of plants and many animals. Also, that the description of the garden of Eden in Genesis is not a part of the Bible, but an interpolation ! Surely, men who can take such liberties as this with the Bible, where its language is plain and simple, should be cautious in condemning others for a more liberal interpretation of some passages which have always perplexed the critic. And further, this supposed interchange of land and water at the epoch of the last deluge, is contrary to many facts in geology ; such as for instance, the occurrence of the remains of land animals on all existing continents, imbedded in the higher strata. Tertiary deposits also, are frequent whose strata are horizontal, and whose level therefore cannot have been essentially altered since their deposition ; for otherwise they would have been tilted up. Yet these deposits were made anterior to the last geological deluge, because its relics are strowed over them. But in giving a history of this subject, we have already entered so fully into the arguments respecting this hypothesis, that we forbear lest we should be repetitious.

3. Another hypothesis imputes the deluge to the sudden elevation of the bottom of the ocean, so as to throw its waters over a part, if not the whole, of existing continents. No fact is more generally admitted, by those conversant with geology, than that our present continents once constituted the bottom of the ocean, and that almost equally certain is it, that different continents and different parts of the same continent, were elevated above the waters at different epochs. A distinguished French geologist, who has paid much attention to this point, thinks he

can distinguish as many as twelve of these epochs among rocks of Europe, and there are several obvious in this country. It is generally admitted, also, that these elevations took place suddenly ; that is, they resulted from a paroxysm of intense power. Let us now imagine a continent, or even a single mountain chain, to be raised from the ocean's depths in a few days, or a few weeks. There can be no doubt but the waters would be driven in mighty waves over those continents, or at least over that part of them which was previously above the waters. Suppose, for example, that the bed of the northern ocean were to be thus lifted up over a vast area, by volcanic agency beneath, that is, by the accumulation of vapor and gas beneath the earth's crust. The result would be, that the waters of the northern ocean, with the vast masses of ice there accumulated, would be driven in a southerly direction, at least over the northern hemisphere. After the fractured crust had permitted the pent up gases, vapors, and lava, to escape, it would gradually subside, and thus bring back the diluvial waters to their former beds in a quiet manner ; and thus, ere long, all traces of the catastrophe would disappear, unless the aqueous currents should have been powerful enough deeply to denude the surface and transport diluvium and bowlders. Now we know that volcanic power does frequently operate in this very manner. Witness the new island of Sabrina, which, in 1811, was raised near the Azores, and gradually sunk back again after a few days : also, in 1831, the island of Hotham, or Graham, in the Mediterranean, which has also disappeared.

We are not anxious that our readers should believe this to have been the mode in which the Noachian deluge was produced. Our main object is to show that a natural cause exists sufficient to have produced that catastrophe, and thus to take away all improbability respecting the occurrence of such an event from its supposed physical impossibility. This is, however, the hypothesis respecting the cause of the Mosaic deluge, that is now extensively adopted by able geologists. Some have imputed it to the elevation of the Andes, others to that of the Alps. It seems to us, however, that there is every probability these mountains were raised from the ocean at an earlier period than that of the scriptural deluge ; and if the deluge of geology be regarded as identical, the waves produced by the lifting up of those mountains would not have flowed in a direction corresponding to the course which we have shown the waters of that

cataclysm to have taken. It is sufficient, however, to show, that geologists in general are now willing to admit that this cause is sufficient to deluge the globe. For, a few years since, it was thought that science could demonstrate the physical impossibility of such an event. We do not contend that this hypothesis is free from difficulties, or that it is to be received as established truth. But we maintain that it is in perfect conformity with the present state of geological science.

Were we disposed to speculate still further, we might suggest, that perhaps in this hypothesis, we find a cause for the powerful rain of forty days that accompanied the deluge. For it is well known, that the vast quantities of aqueous vapor that are liberated when a volcano gets vent, sometimes produce long continued drenching rains. If a powerful eruption took place in northern regions, the vapor set free could be rapidly condensed by the cold, and fall in the form of snow or rain, possibly for a period as long as that described by Moses. But we would not lay much stress on this suggestion.

We here close our protracted comparison of the historical and geological deluges. We are aware that we have conducted our readers, — if indeed they have not grown weary and abandoned us, — through a great deal of what they may consider dry detail. But we have long been satisfied that the superficial and popular view of this subject, which is usually presented, does not bring the true state of the question before the mind, while it tends to prejudice still more against revealed truth, those acute minds who see how shallow and defective is the argument. If any one will thoroughly understand the subject, he must submit to the labor of getting acquainted with the details; and instead of having presented too many of these for this purpose, we know that our reasoning will often appear obscure and inconclusive, because we have not presented more. We shall now close by presenting a summary of the conclusions at which we have arrived.

We have endeavored to show, that the traditions found in all ages and in all nations, civilized and savage, respecting deluges, had probably a common origin, viz. the deluge of Noah; though the facts were often blended with the history of local deluges.

We have shown that most extraordinary revolutions of opinion have taken place respecting the geological deluge; and have reduced the opinions of standard writers of the present day on this subject to three classes: first, some deny that any traces of

a general deluge exist on the globe : secondly, others general deluge to have taken place, but place the epoch occurrence anterior to the creation of man ; and thirdly, not only admit such a catastrophe to have taken place, but suppose it possible it may have been identical with that of

We have attempted to prove, that those who believe are at present no traces in nature of Noah's deluge, thereby brought into collision with the Bible.

In doing this, we have shown that the organic remains secondary and tertiary rocks could not have been deposited there by the Noachian deluge ; and that we are to look for traces of that event only on the surface of the globe.

that the Mosaic account does not require us to presume any marks of that catastrophe would remain to the present. But yet, that the frequent occurrence of deluges in early times as shown by geology, furnishes a presumption in favor of the deluge described in Scripture.

We have shown, that there has been a powerful rush of waters over the northern hemisphere, especially America, from the north and north-west, in comparatively modern times ; proved by the direction in which bowlders and diluvium have been transported, and by grooves and scratches on the surface of rocks, as well as by denuded vallies of considerable depth.

We have inferred that this geological deluge corresponds to that of Scripture, in having been extensive, if not universal, in having taken place in comparatively recent times : and therefore, it is possible the two deluges may have been identical ; though the evidence at present rather preponderates against this opinion.

In considering the objections derived from geology and natural history against the Mosaic account of the deluge, we have concluded that no natural processes have been pointed out on the globe, whose commencement can be proved to have taken place at an earlier date than that event ; though in some instances they might have begun before the flood, and have been subsequently recommenced. Also, that the present state of geological theories renders the submersion of the globe by the flux and reflux of the waters quite possible and probable. Also, that we can explain the existence of the olive in the region of Ararat at the time of the deluge and its subsequent extinction, without resorting to a miracle. Also, that the language of Scripture does not necessarily mean that pairs of all animals on the globe, zoölo-

cally considered, were preserved in the ark ; nor that the flood was universal over the globe, but only in the regions where man dwelt ; and hence that we are not required to suppose that all animals now on the globe have spread from the regions of Ararat. Also, that there may have been a new creation of many species after the deluge ; so that the facts respecting the present distribution of animals, does not conflict with the Mosaic account.

Finally, in inquiring whether any natural causes could have produced the deluge, we have shown that of the three hypotheses maintained in modern times on this subject, the sudden elevation of a mountain or continent by internal force, is the only one that can be defended with any plausibility ; since the approach of a comet to the earth could have produced no such effect, and the idea that our present continents were raised from the bottom of the ocean at that time, is contradicted both by Scripture and geology.

If these conclusions be admitted, every reasonable man will allow, that the Mosaic account of the deluge stands forth fairly and fully vindicated from all collision with the facts of science. Nay, a presumption is hence derived in favor of the Mosaic account. We are aware that some will be disappointed if we do not go further, and say that geology strikingly confirms the Mosaic history, as it has been customary to do in most of our popular treatises on the deluge. But we prefer to take our stand on firm ground. And notwithstanding the multiplied evidences of diluvial action which geology presents, the difficulty of identifying these cataclysms with the Noachian deluge, is so great in the present state of our knowledge, that it is safer to consider the point as unsettled. Nor is this of much importance, so far as revelation is concerned. The truth and inspiration of the Bible rest on a foundation of evidence, independent of physical science, too deep and firm to need the auxiliary support of geology, or natural history. If we can only show, that there is no collision between the facts of revelation and those of science, we have done all that is necessary or important. If any remain skeptical after this is done, the cause of their infidelity does not lie in any scientific difficulties, nor in the want of independent evidence to the truth of the holy Scriptures. It is the fruit of a corrupt and unhumbled heart.

ARTICLE II.

THE UTILITY OF THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS TO
THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS.

By J. Packard.

THE utility of the study of the classics in a college course is now hardly questioned. Their claims have been advocated with so much ability, the decision in their favor has been so unanimous, that we may hope the question is put at rest, and not likely to be soon agitated even in an age so fond of innovation as the present.

But we fear their importance to the theological student is not fully recognized, else we should not with pain witness so universal, and so systematic a renunciation of their study on leaving college.

All history shows that where profane learning has languished, sacred learning has sympathized with it. The one has always been the handmaid to the other, and they have ever gone hand in hand. They sank together in the dark ages; together they rose like the twin lucida sidera of the heavens, when "the sacred Bible was sought out of the dusty corners where profane falsehood and neglect had thrown it, the schools opened, and divine and human learning raked out of the embers of forgotten tongues."* Religion has ever been a friend to profane learning, and never do her misguided friends do her more injury than when they denounce their union. "It was the *christian church*," Bacon well says, "which amidst the inundations of the Scythians on the one side from the north-west, and the Saracen from the east, did preserve in the sacred lap and bosom thereof, the *precious relics of heathen learning*, which other wise had been extinguished, as if they had never been."† We hold to the positions, that there cannot be too much human learning if it is but sanctified; that religion lends to learning her highest finish, and most excellent grace; and, that every thing may be rendered subservient to the illustration of divine truth. Profane learning may embellish sacred. To use the quaint

* Milton.

† Advancement of Learning, p. 52. London Edit.

illustrations of the fathers: The Egyptians may be spoiled of their gold and silver and fine garments in which they trusted, the sword may be wrested from Goliath's hand to cut off his own head,* and Hiram with his Tyrians and uncircumcised artificers may be employed to build a temple to Jehovah's glory.

The most insidious blow ever aimed at Christianity was the edict of the emperor Julian, forbidding the classical authors to be taught and explained in christian schools. This malignant enemy of Christianity was sagacious enough to see that if the study of the classics was neglected, the true method of interpreting the Bible would soon be lost; legitimate principles of hermeneutics would soon be forgotten, and Christians would resort to scholastic subtleties, find no end or bottom in speculation after departing from the simplicity of the text, and at length sink down into absurd superstitions.† The fathers took the alarm at once, and used all their efforts to counteract so malignant a design. Several of them composed Greek and Latin manuals, and even wrote poems and works on sacred subjects which would compensate in the best manner possible, for the loss of the classics. Augustine‡ expressly classes this decree among the *persecutions* of the Christians by Julian.

Augustine advises that we should spoil the heathen authors of their precious illustrations, and embellishments, and make them subservient to the preaching of the gospel.§ He speaks figuratively of Cyprian as having robbed the Egyptians of their gold and silver and fine linen. Augustine, though unacquainted with Hebrew and Greek, always strenuously recommended their study.|| Gregory Nazianzen thus speaks: "Learning holds the

* "Intorquere de manibus hostium gladium et Goliae superbissimi caput proprio mucrone truncare."—*Jerome*.

† "As soon as the study of languages languished after the days of the apostles, the gospel faith, and the whole of religion declined, and many grievous errors and blind superstitions arose from ignorance of the languages. On the other hand, when the languages revived, the gospel shed abroad a glorious light, and accomplished so much, that the whole world looked on in surprise, and was forced to confess, that we had the gospel almost as pure and unadulterated as the apostles."—*Epist. Opp. T. XIX. 339. Lips.*

‡ *De Civit. Dei, Lib. XVIII. c. 52.*

§ *De Doctr. Christiana, Lib. II. 60.*

|| *Neque enim ex Hebraea lingua, quam ignora.* Origen's acquaintance with Hebrew is very suspicious. Jerome of all the fathers

first place among human blessings. I do not only speak of christian learning but of profane, which common Christians, from a misguided judgment, hold in contempt as insidious, dangerous and withdrawing the affections from God.”* So thought the reformers, especially Luther. His testimony is very emphatic. He says : “ If by our fault we lose the learned languages by neglect, we shall lose the gospel.† Divine wisdom has revived classical learning for the sake of restoring the gospel, which soon after arose from its ashes, and in this way overthrew the tyranny of papacy. For the same reason Greece is subjected to the Turks, that the exiled Greeks, dispersed through all nations, should carry with them the Greek language, and thus give others an opportunity of learning it. From this we infer, that we shall never preserve the gospel unless by the aid of the languages.”‡ It would be difficult to make a selection from the passages in Luther’s works, all having the same sentiment. Similar were the sentiments of Melancthon and the earlier German theologians, though some of them have been falsely accused of decrying human learning. Melancthon remarks : “ An unlearned theology is altogether an *ILLIAD* of evils. For it is an ill-digested system, in which points of great moment are not fully explained, those are confounded which should be kept distinct, and again those are put asunder, which nature requires to be united. Such a system cannot but produce infinite errors and endless divisions, because in such a want of arrangement, one understands one thing, and another another, and while each one defends his own fancy, divisions and contentions arise.”§ How

seems to have understood it the best.—See Gesen. *Geschichte d Hebraischen Sprache*, p. 91.

* Orat. XXX. Tom. II. p. 496.

† “ Si culpa nostra commiserimus, ut linguas eruditas negligamus, Evangelium amittamus.”

‡ “ Nos evangelium nunquam retenturos esse, nisi fiat linguarum auxilio.”

§ “ Omnino Ilias malorum est inerudita Theologia. Est enim confusanea doctrina in qua magnae res non explicantur diserte, miscetur ea, quae oportebat sejungi, rursus illa, quae natura conjungi poterat distrahuntur. Talis doctrina non potest non gignere infinitos errores, infinitam dissipationem, quia in tanta confusione alius aliter intelligit et dum suum quisque somnium defendit, existunt certamina et dissensiones.”—Tom. I. p. 329.

faithful a picture of many systems of theology, not guarded and secured by scientific arrangement and therefore not proof against fatal attacks ! Spener, one of the revivers of evangelical religion in Germany, observes : “ I know not any one of all human studies, in all departments of learning, which may not in its proper place become of real use to a student, if it is pursued without neglecting what is essential and if rightly applied.” Again, Spener says : “ I wish all students were not only more pious, but more *learned* ; and on that account of those who are pious, the more learned is always the more acceptable. A christian student prays as earnestly for divine illumination, as if he required no diligence of his own ; but he studies also with the same diligence as if his labors were to effect every thing. For it were a presumption and tempting of God only to pray and then to await the divine illumination without one’s own exertions.” Calvin well remarks : “ *Scientia tamen nihil propterea quod inflat magis vituperanda est quam gladius si in manus furiosi incidat.*” — Learning is no more to be blamed for puffing up, than a sword, which falls into the hands of a madman.

But not to multiply witnesses — all the reformers felt that even profane learning was from God, and to be applied to his glory. The study of the classics familiarizes us with the spirit of antiquity, and thus assists us in the interpretation of the sacred Scriptures. Whatever calls off our minds from the present, and carries us back to the past, contributes to our right understanding of the spirit of the ancient world. As it is, we are so far separated from it, that we forget that the ancients were men of like passions with us, having the same joys and griefs. We need to live intellectually in the ancient world if we would imbibe its spirit. We must temporarily adopt their notions, their modes of thinking, feeling and expression. Their ways of life, their household, every day habits must become familiar to us. We must put ourselves in their situation and not look at them through the spectacles of our own peculiarities. This indeed requires a peculiar promptness and flexibility of mental habits, but it is also in a very considerable degree the result of long continued study. The difficulty of transferring ourselves to the past is increased in proportion the further we go back. Thus it is more difficult to drink in the spirit of the Pentateuch, composed in the very infancy and morning freshness of the world, than that of Homer. The study of the latter, however, throws great light upon the former. Homer undoubtedly lived in Asia

Minor and under a similar climate with Palestine. This proximity of country would naturally lead to similarity of language, and above all to analogy in thought and expression. There is a sameness in human nature every where under the same degree of culture. Greater benefit may therefore be derived from a study of the Greek, than of the Latin classics. They are the more ancient, and their climate was more similar.

Homer was in fact the secular Bible of mankind for many ages. It has been well said by one highly competent to judge: "The Old Testament and the Iliad reflect light mutually, each on the other, and both in respect of poetry and morals, it may with great truth be said that he who has the longest studied, and the most deeply imbibed the spirit of the Hebrew Bible will the best understand, and the most lastingly appreciate the tale of Troy divine."* We are continually struck in reading Homer with the similarity of manners and spirit, and parallelisms of language that constantly occur.

To hold communion with the past, we must live not only intellectually, but as it were physically in a foreign clime. To understand the Scriptures we must live under the burning sun of Palestine. Another heavens must be over our head another earth beneath our feet. We must live amidst its winter torrents, and its summer brooks—its deep ravines and its extensive caves—we must look upon its barren fig trees, its olives, its cedars—the glory of Lebanon, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon. In a word we must be familiar with the objects, which suggested the pictures and imagery of Scripture if we would think over the same thoughts with its writers and feel again their feelings.

The study of the classics materially assists in the interpretation of the Scriptures. As the same principles of interpretation are applicable to both, he will be, *caeteris paribus*, the best interpreter who has been accustomed to interpret the classics. The habits he has formed are just the habits which are needed for an interpreter of Scripture. Origen among the fathers strongly recommended the classics as an excellent preparatory discipline to the study of the Scriptures; for errors in their interpretation, which the tyro at first would naturally make, would be less dangerous. The greatest masters of interpretation have

* H. N. Coleridge's *Introduction to the Greek Classic Poets*, p. 7 a book worthy of all praise.

all times concurred in this opinion of the importance of the study of the classics—and one's habits of interpretation strengthen the judgment, give it acumen and a discrimination of things that differ. Perhaps no faculty is more susceptible of cultivation. Hence the great advantage of the study of the classics in early life. The habit of weighing and balancing evidence for or against a particular interpretation gives acuteness to the judgment even in moral decisions.

And here we might remark that the Greek classics are particularly interesting as written in the language of the New Testament. We are aware there is a difference in the idiom, the mould in which they are cast, and even in the signification of individual words. But still no one will deny that we could not dispense with classical Greek in the interpretation of the New Testament. Luther's prediction, we doubt not, is substantially true that if Greek is lost, we shall lose the Gospel. Translations would soon become obsolete, the streams would become more and more impure the further from the fountain head, and that too without remedy, or with any means of purifying them. Like the schoolmen, theologians would resort to fanciful, allegorical expositions, to subtleties, to endless quibbles, and gross darkness would brood over the world.

The study of the classics has a well nigh marvellous effect in refining the taste, and quickening the sense of the beautiful. Now as so much of the Bible is poetry, how important that we should be conversant with the best ancient poets! Though the language is different, yet it admits of illustration and comparison from the classic poets. We have but to turn to Lowth, Knapp and Grotius to see how much may be borrowed from the classics to illustrate the Scriptures. The poetry of all nations has many points in common; though it may differ in imagery and costume. In all alike, it is the language of excited feeling, and differs in the language of ordinary life not only in diction, but in the predominance of the imagination and fancy. If this is so, the poetry of one nation may be illustrated from the universal poetic language of others. Much of the Bible is in poetry for the sake of making a deeper impression than a dry didactic manner. He, who knew all the avenues to the human heart, for he made it, has presented truth in such a way as to interest his intelligent creatures.

He who is absolute master of this poetic language, wields a powerful instrument of persuasion. We have barely alluded to

the effects of the study of the classics upon the style. Paradoxical as it may first appear, they bring us back to the simplicity of nature, give us a distaste for false ornaments, the *dulcia vitia*, which so often mislead the tyro and render our language better adapted to the comprehension of the uneducated. Their noblest works are continually warning us to be simple. Cicero says, "In dicendo vitium vel maximum esse a *vulgari genere orationis*, atque a *consuetudine communis sensus* abhorre." If we follow such guides we cannot easily go wrong, or fall into dangerous errors of style.*

We are sorry the classics have lost their ancient appellation of the *humanities*, such is their effect in humanizing man, that they preëminently deserve this title. The orations found in the Greek classics form the best model for the preacher. With one consent both antiquity and modern times have pronounced them the models which approach nearest perfection. They have gained the universal suffrage of all times and ages. They have reached the summit of well-nigh unattainable perfection, and are now gazed at afar off. We hesitate not to say, that if the orations of Demosthenes were critically, and *aesthetically* studied, they would go very far in giving the student a taste for real simplicity, they would cure him of the vulgar appetite for tropes and metaphors and flowers; of seeking ornaments for their own sake; of going out of his way for flowers, instead of plucking them if found in his path. We speak that we do know, and testify that we have *tried*, that the faithful, of a reviewed study of one of Demosthenes's orations — that De Corona for instance — would do more to give the student right apprehensions of true eloquence, than the study of all the works of rhetoric in our language. The student who has never read his orations will be astonished, as Rheinhard was, at his naturalness, his simplicity and want of affectation and ornament. It was the model Rheinhard followed, and we would hold him to the theological student as a safe one. Could his style of argument and warmth be copied, its success would be infallible over a modern audience. The style of no orator of antiquity could be so safely copied in the pulpit. We almost wi

* "Tanquam scopulum sic vites insolens verbum," said Caesar. We need not refer to the numerous rules of the same nature to be found in that most invaluable compend of rhetoric, Horace's *Postica*.

though it may shock some of our readers, that the stereotype models of pulpit eloquence, particularly of the French school, might be fairly put an end to. The world would be no loser ; bombast would be exchanged for simplicity, and art for nature.

Let but the preacher be as deeply imbued with his subject, with nothing but his subject, as Demosthenes was ; let him drop himself, as Paul did ; let him seek only to be understood and felt ; let him use that vehement reasoning, that "logic set on fire," which Demosthenes used, and with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, he would do wonders in converting sinners from the power of Satan unto God. Perhaps the student even after a repeated perusal will not be fully prepared to sympathize with the glowing feelings of Wyttenbach,* who found nothing of eloquence in Demosthenes the first three readings. "At the fourth, an unusual and super-human emotion pervaded my mind. I could now see the orator at one time all ardor ; at another in anguish, at another borne away by an impulse which nothing could resist. As I proceed, the same ardor is kindled in my own mind, and I am carried away by the same impulse. I fancy that I am Demosthenes himself, standing before the assembly, delivering this oration and exhorting the Athenians to emulate the bravery and glory of their ancestors. I can no longer read the oration silently, but aloud."† Though the student may not be able to go all lengths with Wyttenbach, yet he will feel and admire the manner in which Demosthenes gains his purpose ; now by concentrated argument, hurled like a thunderbolt ; now by withering irony and sarcasm,

* See Stuart's Dissertations on the Study of the Original Languages of the Bible, p. 58.

† Why is not the De Coronâ of Demosthenes studied more in our Colleges ? This one oration thoroughly *mastered* would do more for the mere acquisition of the Greek language, than a collection of scraps and beauties, from all the most eminent Greek orators. It is very important that a student should feel he has *mastered* some one author ; besides, by hurrying from Lysias to Isocrates, and from Isocrates to Demosthenes, he loses all that might facilitate his progress in any one author from familiarity with his style. The use of Collectanea has a tendency to give miscellaneous, unsystematic and ill-digested knowledge. The student collects a few vague ideas, some moral precepts, some jokes, and some accounts of battles, instead of habits of patient thought or an acquaintance with the *general* style of any one author.

and thus attains the highest intellectual eminency the world has ever seen, that of

“Wielding at will that fierce democratic,
Shaking the arsenal, and fulminating over Greece,
To Macedon and Artaxerxes’ throne.”*

We would, were it practicable, that the classics could be studied to some limited extent in our theological seminaries as is the custom in Germany. But we fear it is out of the question. Short as is the term of our theological study, the youth of our land are disposed *practically* to make it shorter. Under the specious plea, that the harvest is great, and the Lord hath need of them, they take a *short cut* in theology, and run before they are sent. They find when too late that they have deceived themselves and robbed their minds of that knowledge and experience, by which they might have been thoroughly furnished unto every good word and work. If the student in private would keep up his classical studies, the same object would be gained.

And we would here remark, that the neglect of classical studies is to be attributed in some measure to the manner in which they are taught in the academy and college. The student, perhaps, never was interested in them; he never thought of them otherwise than a hard lesson to be conned over, recited, and as soon as possible forgotten. He knew that Xenophon was easy Greek, and Thucydides hard Greek; but he never felt the inspiration, the freshness, the force, the truth to nature of the classics. He never looked to the living soul which animates them. He never entered into their magic circle, was never initiated into these mysteries which are eminently *φωρη-εργα σμυρολόγιν*, which only have a voice and significance for the initiated.

“They have no ear, nor soul to apprehend
The sublime notion and high mystery.”†

One of the most common pleas for the neglect of the classics is the want of leisure amidst the arduous duties of the ministry. But we fear indolence is generally at the root of the matter, the want of a true scholar-like feeling and spirit. The time

* Milton's *Paradise Regained*, Book IV.

† Milton's *Comus*.

required is not great ; the benefit in improving the style and tone of thinking, real and lasting. One hour a day redeemed from relaxation, from company, or in any other way consistently with duty, would accomplish large results. It would keep alive classical studies, would enable the student to advance a step, and would add something to his intellectual opulence. We would ask the student to be honest with himself, and inquire whether an hour, not assigned to other duties, could be spent more profitably. That it is possible to find time even in the most faithful and laborious ministerial life, we learn in the case of Robert Hall. "He thought himself defective," his biographer remarks, "in a tasteful and critical acquaintance with the Greek poets. He read the Iliad and Odyssey twice over ; proceeding with nearly equal care, through nearly all the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides, and thence extended his classical reading in all directions. To the Latin and Greek poets, orators, and historians, he devoted a part of every day for three years. He studied them as a scholar, but he also studied them as a moralist and philosopher, so that while he appreciated their peculiarities and beauties with his wonted taste, and carefully improved his style of writing and his tone of thinking by the study of the best models, he suffered them not to depreciate his esteem for the moderns." *

Another excuse, not now so frequently advanced as formerly, but perhaps not the less secretly entertained, is found by the student in the danger to spirituality of mind from the study of the classics. That this is not necessarily the case might be shown from the examples of Calvin, Melancthon, and the fathers of the English church — men, who were the great lights of the age in which they lived, and whose works posterity will not willingly let die. Though they were men of various erudition, though they had rifled the treasures of the old and mighty world, grappled with whole libraries and ranged the whole circle of human knowledge, yet they bowed as low at the foot of the cross, and their piety was as simple, humble and childlike, as though they had just known, and known no more, than that the Bible was from God.

But we need not enter the lists as apologists for profane

* Gregory's Life, p. 54. Am. Edit. — Pareau well remarks, "*Per universum horum studiorum cursum, ne tunc quidem eas literas omittat negligatque, quando gravissima officia doctoris christiani habebit.*"

learning. We are not set for its defence as was Bacon, who in his *Advancement of Learning* refutes in detail, the various objections against it. We are fallen on different times and different circumstances.

We fear that in most cases indolence will here be found to be at the bottom of such an excuse. Vitringa, whose spirituality was never questioned by those who knew him, thus spoke : “*Tandem nemo cum ratione existimet diffusius hoc studii literarii genus inimicum esse pietati, mentemque distrahere ab arctiore commercio cum Deo in Christo per exercitationem vero fidei et meditationis. Sane qui hoc sibi persuadeant, segnitiei suae obtendant.*” In the same Preface to his *Observations*, a most erudite and valuable work, he laments that while the field of theology is so extensive, theological students confine themselves within such narrow bounds, stick at first principles, and do not go on unto perfection in knowledge : *per integram vitam in ipsis haereant principiis.**

We are fully persuaded that learning may enlarge our views of truth without weakening our faith, that we may be learned ourselves without having a learned religion.

It is a sad proof of our depravity, that the complacency in the exercise of our powers is unfavorable to that feeling of humility and that sense of our deep wants which draws us to the Redeemer.

But yet such a union of deep piety and profound learning is not only practicable, but has actually been witnessed in the instances before alluded to. The spirit of the age as alien to such pursuits may be offered as an excuse by some. It is indeed a most restless, stirring age, as busy after the *τὸ καινότερον* as ever were the Greeks of Demosthenes’s or Paul’s time, an age of innovation and demolition. But for this very reason should

* Buddaeus, one of the most learned men of his age, remarks : “It is of no use to conceal our diseases. When I look around, I am overwhelmed with grief, nay, am astonished, when I consider how few students come up to the expectations and wishes of the church. One reason is, that they spend so short a time at school, as scarcely to lay the foundation or learn the elements of theology, (*quod commorantur brevi admodum tempore in academiis ; quod quidem addiscendis necessariis, aut fundamentis rite ponendis visi sufficit.*) So far from aspiring to high attainments, they scarcely catch a glimpse of the wide field, and ever after stick at first principles.” *Praef. ad Isagogen ad Theologiam Universam.*

the student make a stand, and resist such a spirit. Who is to do it if he does not, whose very business and profession is to regulate others, to be the light of the world, the salt of the earth in an intellectual, as well as in a moral and religious respect? He would be treacherous to his cause were he to be carried with the multitude to do evil. Rather should he be a rallying point, rather should his voice be heard

“In worst extremes and on the perilous edge of battle.”*

But we would have all this knowledge sanctified. If there was the only alternative of doing the one, and leaving the other undone, we would say with Leighton, “one devout thought is worth all human learning.” Though we set great store by learning, yet we set far higher by devout piety; we would have all the light possible from whatever source, concentrated upon the sacred page, till it glows and burns, till a more excellent glory gilds it. Then shall we find our studies profitable and availing when all our ends are single — for truth — for Christ.

ARTICLE III.

LITERARY IMPOSTURES.

By David Fosdick, Jr. Boston.

WITH no great effort at amplification this theme might be made to occupy a considerable series of historical volumes. Our readers may judge, therefore, how uncomfortable is the sense of compression which we experience in undertaking to consider it within the limits of a few pages.

In the first place, what are we to understand by the expression *literary imposture*? Would it be an erroneous use of language to denominate *all bad writers* impostors? Are we bound to employ milder terms than *fraud*, *imposition*, in speaking of productions which under false pretences rob men of their time and their money; which, not only serve no useful purpose, but effect vast injury, convey grossly distorted conceptions of the

* Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Book I.

subjects which they treat, and falsify both facts and principles ? He who presents himself before mankind in print impliedly promises that it shall be worth a reader's while to give him audience. If performance does not equal promise, there is clearly a breach of faith, and readers are defrauded. The plea of praiseworthy intent will perhaps be urged in bar. In very many cases, however, this pretension cannot be set up with any shadow of reason, the accused having written only to make a book for the sake of acquiring money, celebrity, or other like advantage to himself, without thinking of benefit to accrue to his readers ; and in most cases when the plea can be honestly urged against a harsh sentence for failure in performance, its validity is questionable, since the intention to benefit mankind cannot at all exculpate a bad author, if it be his own fault that he is ignorant of his incapacity. How few bad writers would pass the ordeal of these observations unscathed ; and what a large proportion of the books with which the world has been deluged must, in consequence, be denominated *literary impostures* ! How many writers of professedly erudite "folios, quartos, 8vos., twelves," have been almost utterly devoid of acquaintance with the subjects which they treated, perhaps extending their works in exact, but alas ! inverse, proportion to their knowledge ! How many histories are there which well deserve to be ranked with the production of one Peter Comestor, which is termed by D'Israeli "a history of all things and a bad history of every thing !" How many poets have "poured along the town a flood of rhyme," which attracted notice, if at all, only on account of the extent or source of the inundation ! How many writers of every class say a great deal and mean nothing ! How many think they mean something, perhaps really do, but express themselves so obscurely as to affect only the eye or ear, without insinuating a particle of sense into the understanding ! There are men in our day who appear to be of the same mind as Lycophron, a Greek poet, who protested that he would hang himself if he found a person that could understand his "Cassandra." Were such men by chance to write somewhat which could be comprehended, and, upon discovering the slip which they had made, to hang themselves incontinently, the world, I opine, could hardly be considered a loser. Quintilian says that the obscurity of a writer is generally in proportion to his incapacity. The ancients seem to have outdone the moderns (and certainly this is saying much,) in regard to obscurity of style.

•

It was inculcated by a teacher of rhetoric in Quintilian's time as an ornament ; and he compelled his pupils to correct such passages of their writings as were too intelligible.

The words of Byron :

" 'Tis pleasant, sure, to see one's name in print ;
A book's a book, although there's nothing in't,"

are very true, and we might be content that the many who have been moved to their literary effusions solely or chiefly by the prospect of this gratification, should enjoy it without censure, were it not that it is procured at an immensely disproportionate expense on the part of the public, — an expense which no principle of benevolence requires that it should encounter.

As will be presumed, however, it is not our intention to take the term *literary imposture* in this large sense. The attempt to collect and recount even the names alone of those who, through the ambition of appearing in the character of author, have perpetrated grievous impositions upon the good sense and patience of mankind, would be vain.

Taking a more narrow, and therefore more suitable, view of our subject, we may conveniently, perhaps with exact precision, divide *literary impostors* into the following classes. I. Such as appropriate to themselves the productions or the thoughts of others with the intent that they shall pass as their own. II. Such as attempt to give a false aspect to their own figments by incorrect ascription of their authorship. III. Such as publish intentional untruth.

The first class consists of writers commonly denominated, from the Latin, *plagiarists*.

It is not the case, however, that all borrowing is plagiarism, in any odious sense. A writer may derive hints from the productions of other men, without laying himself open to the slightest censure. Thus Milton, it is said, drew the suggestion of his *Paradise Lost* from an Italian drama or mystery ; and Dante that of his *Inferno* from the "Vision" of Alberico. If the statement be true, it does not at all detract from the merit of either writer ; for the merit of neither depends at all upon that which they are supposed to have borrowed. Nor can any man, with propriety, venture to term it a disingenuous course to adopt an idea, even without acknowledgement, when the accompaniments and the costume, the things of main importance, and which, indeed, gave the idea all its value, were

original. Every one can see that such an adoption is very different from the silent, literal transfer of lines, sentences, or paragraphs out of another's production into one's own, or the silent appropriation of another's thoughts with a fraudulent attempt at concealment by alterations in the form of expression, by the destruction of the writing which is pillaged, or by any other like means. No writer can be said to act honorably, who borrows, in full consciousness that he is doing so, any important thought or expression without acknowledgement. Still, there have been men of considerable reputation, who could unblushingly advocate this species of robbery, and even inculcate the art of effecting it without incurring the hazard of detection. A French professor, named Richesource, published two books exhibiting the principles of authorship which he assiduously taught his pupils in his private lectures. The first of these books was entitled : "The Mask of Orators, or the manner of disguising with ease all kinds of composition." His definition of plagiarism, as stated by D'Israeli, is as follows : "It is the art, or an ingenious and easy mode, which some adroitly employ to change or disguise all sorts of speeches of their own composition or of that of other authors, for their pleasure or their utility, in such a manner that it becomes impossible even for the author himself to recognize his own work, his own genius, and his own style, so skilfully shall the whole be disguised." The art he makes to consist in arranging the parts of a sentence in a different order, exchanging one word or phrase for another which is equivalent, etc. Thus for *probity* a plagiarist would substitute *religion* or *virtue* ; for *capacity*, *ability* or *erudition*, etc. His second work was denominated "The Art of Writing and Speaking ; or a method of composing all sorts of letters, and holding a polite conversation." At the close of the preface to this book he informs his readers, that authors who may be in want of essays, sermons, pleadings, letters or verses may be accommodated on application to him. It seems he was resolved not to belie his name. A *Riche-source* (rich source) he must have been indeed to indolent or incapable persons who desired to enjoy the reputation of authorship.

It has been too general a practice among clergymen in all christian countries, least of all probably in ours, to appropriate to their own use, in preaching, the printed or MS. sermons of their more gifted or at least more prolific brethren. In England and France, perhaps in other countries, it is common for ser-

mons to be printed in a type resembling manuscript, for the purpose of general circulation among clergymen.

Rollin, in his work on the Belles-Lettres, if we remember right, speaks of the practice prevalent in his time, of culling materials for sermons from the productions of the fathers, not only without censure, but with positive tokens of approbation.

It is beyond doubt that many works of the ancients have been lost to the world from the anxiety of those who had pilfered out of them that their thefts might be concealed. In the middle ages, when copies of ancient works were extremely rare, the temptation was great, to one who came by accident into possession of a MS. which was most probably the only one in existence, to despoil it of its contents, circulate them in his own name, and destroy the evidence of his plagiarism. Many of the fathers, it is pretty certain, now stalk majestically in borrowed robes ; and many will probably retain their ill-gotten dignity down to the latest generations. Augustine is said to have been deeply indebted to Varro, a learned Roman writer, for the contents of his great work "The City of God ;" and to this circumstance we owe the loss of almost all Varro's numerous and very valuable writings, they having been burned by Pope Gregory VII. to screen Augustine from the charge of plagiarism.

In later times Leonard Aretino, a scholar of eminence, having found a Greek MS. of Procopius on the Gothic war, translated it into Latin and published it as his own production. It passed as such until the accidental discovery of another MS. of the same work revealed his fraud.

We know that Cicero wrote a work in two books on *Glory* ; for he refers to it himself in his treatise *De Officiis*.* Petrarch was in possession of it. He sent it to his preceptor, who, under the pressure of extreme poverty, pawned it, and died soon after without disclosing where it was. It was never recovered. Years afterward, this treatise of Cicero was noticed in a catalogue of books bequeathed to a monastery. Search was made for it, but it could not be found. Peter Alcyonius, who was physician to the monastery, published a book *De Exilio*, which contained many splendid passages not at all of a piece with the rest of the production. It was therefore reasonably surmised that he had purloined the MS., applied to his own purpose such

* L. II. c. 9.

parts of it as were susceptible of such application, and then destroyed it.

In 1649 Barbosa, bishop of Ugento, obtained by accident an ancient work which he published in his own name under the title, *De Officio Episcopi*. The accident referred to was this. His attention was attracted to a leaf of MS. around a fish which was brought into his house by one of his servants. Being interested by the perusal of it, he searched for and procured the volume of which it formed a part, and published it as we have stated.

We will mention a few instances of bold plagiarism in later days. Richard Cumberland published some excellent versions of fragments of the Greek dramatists, and long enjoyed the reputation of Greek scholarship, while, in truth, the learning he exhibited was almost all derived from MS. notes of his grandfather, the celebrated Dr. Bentley, respecting which notes he at first maintained entire silence. Ultimately, however, he acknowledged his obligation, being driven by a direct charge to the alternative of acknowledgement or the dangerous as well as criminal commission of falsehood.

Dr. Middleton was very much indebted to a Scotch writer named Bellenden in many parts of his famous *Life of Cicero*. As he was cautiously silent in regard to his Scotch benefactor, and the work of the latter, "*De tribus luminibus*," was exceedingly rare, the plagiarism was not exposed to the public generally for a considerable time. It was, however, early whispered about among the learned, and at length Dr. Parr republished Bellenden's book, prefixing a preface partly occupied with remarks on Middleton's unfair procedure. When Parr's exposure appeared, it occurred to the recollection of a gentleman who had been acquainted with Dr. Middleton, that, just before the publication of the *Life of Cicero*, he happened to ask Middleton if he had seen Bellendenus, and that at the inquiry he faltered, grew pale, and acknowledged he had. Undoubtedly the rarity of Bellenden's work gave Middleton hopes of escaping detection. It is said that there were not then more than ten copies to be found in all the libraries of England. It was published on the continent, we believe at Paris, where Bellenden resided; and the whole impression, with the exception of a few copies, was lost in a storm on the English coast, which drove the vessel containing it to the bottom. Such was its rarity, that it is not mentioned by some of the most noted bib-

liographical writers, Morhof, Schelhorn, etc. Middleton is charged by Dr. Parr and others, probably on just grounds, with the perpetration of numerous plagiarisms in other productions of his pen.

The secret history of the authorship of literary productions would strip many a name of the reputation it enjoys, and place laurels on the brow of many a man who

“ In life’s low vale remote has pined alone,
Then dropped into the grave, unpitied and unknown !”

Rank and wealth have obtained unmerited eminence in the literary world, at the expense of the time and abilities of gifted dependents. The famous book called *Eikōn Basilikē*, which passed as the production of Charles I., is now known not to have been written by that king. It is supposed, though perhaps not satisfactorily proved, to have been written by one Gauden. Cardinal Richelieu, the French minister, employed a poet of the name of Chapelain to compose productions for him, which he circulated as his own, and which served to procure him some little reputation as a fine writer. Of this reputation he is said to have been more jealous and more proud than of his statesmanship. Henry VIII. is supposed not to have been the author of the Latin work against Luther which passed under his name and procured him from Pope Leo X. the title of Defender of the Faith. Instances of this nature might be multiplied to a very great extent.

Besides the influence exerted by station and riches over obscurity and poverty, other circumstances have often led to incorrect ascriptions of the authorship of books. The work which passes under the name of *Hogarth’s Analysis of Beauty* was written for Hogarth by Dr. Morrell, as some say, or according to others by Dr. Hoadly. Of the noted Bampton Lectures, those delivered in 1784 by Dr. White, and published as his in one of the volumes of the series, were almost wholly the work of Dr. Parr and a clergyman named Badcock. Dr. White made use of the good offices of both his friends, without informing either of the assistance given him by the other. Accident led Dr. Parr to the discovery of this course of double-dealing, and he immediately published a merciless disclosure of the facts. *Raleigh’s History of the World* (so called) was in great part the production of a Dr. Robert Burrel, who was confined with Sir Walter in the Tower during its composition. To him

Raleigh owed most of the recondite learning displayed in his History. There were likewise other contributors ; among them Ben Jonson.

The following curious account respecting a literary debtor to others is given by D'Israeli. "Sir John Hill owned to a friend once when he fell sick, that he had over-fatigued himself with writing seven works at once, one of which was on architecture and another on cookery ! This hero once contracted to translate Swammerdam's work on insects for fifty guineas. After the agreement with the bookseller he perfectly recollected that he did not understand a single word of the Dutch language ; nor did there exist a French translation. The work, however, was not the less done for this small obstacle. Sir John bargained with another translator for twenty-five guineas. The second translator was precisely in the same situation as the first ; as ignorant, though not so well paid, as the knight. He bargained with a third, who perfectly understood his original, for twelve guineas ! So that the translators who could not translate," says D'Israeli, "feasted on venison, and turtle, while the modest drudge, whose name never appeared to the world, broke in patience his daily bread ? The craft of authorship," he adds, "has many mysteries."

The second class of literary impostors consists of *forgers*. To this class belong the authors of those impostures which may be denominated religio-literary forgeries. Such are the religious books of all pagan nations ; the Sibylline books of the Romans, the Koran of the Mohammedans, the Vedas of India, the Zend-Avesta, or *living word*, of the Persians and Medians, our own apocryphal books, etc. Each of these religio-literary impostures would singly afford ample materials for an entire article. We shall content ourselves with this cursory mention of them and sweep them aside *en masse*.

Turn we now to forgeries unconnected thus with religion. The number, unblushing impudence, and intricate ingenuity of such frauds task the power of belief. They are to be found in every department of literature.

It was strenuously maintained by Father Hardouin, a French Jesuit of great learning, that nearly all the works ascribed to ancient authors in Greece and Rome were forged in the thirteenth century. He excepted from this singular imputation only the works of Cicero and Pliny the Elder, together with some of those which bear the repute of having been written

by Horace and Virgil. The idea was an extravagant one, and cannot for a moment be regarded with favor by any reflecting and well-regulated mind. It is not to be denied, however, that very many of the works which have come down to us as genuine productions of the ancient authors whose names they bear are most probably altogether spurious ; and that a far larger number of them have undergone interpolation to a greater or less extent. There is little reason to suppose that, of the deceptions practised by the monks of the middle ages in relation to the works of the ancients, those which have as yet eluded the sagacity and research of the learned will ever be detected. The probability of exposure is at least as much diminished by the lapse of time since the perpetration of the frauds and by the influence of prescription, as increased by the additional number of minds engaged in the examination of the Greek and Roman writers (so called) or by the new facilities offered to investigation. Considering the character of the middle ages in regard to literature, we can hardly hope for any means of detecting frauds of this nature except internal evidence in the productions themselves ; and, in most cases, this has long been estimated as correctly as possible, and a verdict given accordingly. The dim light with which the doings of those days are and ever must be wrapt, revealing to view scarce anything but the more prominent political convulsions, though affording some casual glimpses of literary and social phenomena, will scarce suffice to direct our scrutiny into the lurking-places of those facts with which we might oppose and defeat the influence of prescription as to the genuineness of many works which are referred to the classic periods of Greek or Roman literature.

Of the known forgeries since the Christian era and before the dawn of letters, we will make special mention of two or three. Philostratus, the philosopher, who flourished in the third century, composed a life of the celebrated impostor Apollonius Tyaneus from records purporting to have been made by Damis, who was not only a contemporary of Apollonius, but his friend and constant companion in travelling. That these records were spurious there is clear internal evidence. Among other things, the hero Apollonius appears in Babylon, and thereupon a description is given of that celebrated city, not a word of which is applicable to the period, as at that time Babylon was almost utterly desolate, its splendor having been long since absorbed by Seleucia.

There is a history of the Jewish War, which passes under the name of Hegesippus, the Jew. He lived in the reigns of Antoninus and Commodus, i. e. in the latter half of the second century ; and yet mention is made in this work of Constantinople, Scotland, and Saxony !

Annius of Viterbo, or John Nanni, a Dominican friar of the fifteenth century, who was made master of the sacred palace by Pope Alexander VI., employed his leisure in the composition of fragments which he endeavored to palm upon the world as newly discovered remains of ancient writers. They were comprised in seventeen books of Antiquities, as he styled his forgeries, and bore the names of Sanchoniathon, Berosus and others. He subsequently added commentaries, composed mainly of forged passages ascribed to unknown authors. These fragments and commentaries were for a while extremely well-received by many of the learned throughout Europe. The blunders which they contained finally led to the detection of their author. He died, however, without confessing the fabrication, and from his respectability and pertinacity the Antiquities have still been supposed by some to be genuine writings of the authors to whom he ascribed them, or at least to have been thus regarded by Annius. The Dominicans, that the stain of such a forgery might not attach to their order, asserted that Annius derived his publications from a MS. belonging to the Colbertine library ; but the existence of such a MS. was never satisfactorily proved. The success of the forgery is somewhat remarkable, though its magnitude was not very great, the whole collection of fragments amounting to less than 200 pages. At their first appearance they excited deep interest. Four parties were speedily formed, one pronouncing them forgeries by Annius, a second declaring that they were forged before the editor's time, a third regarding them as partly genuine and partly interpolated by the editor, and a fourth sustaining their entire genuineness.

The papal supremacy over the countries denominated the States of the Church originated in pretended grants made to the popes by Pepin and Charlemagne. There is no other proof of these grants than that contained in certain charters alleged to have been bestowed by Louis le Débonnaire, Otho I. and Henry I. Notwithstanding the strenuous efforts which have been made by some Catholic writers to sustain the authenticity of these charters, they are pretty generally regarded as having

been forged to give color to the papal appropriation of the territories referred to. In like manner, deeds and inscriptions, designed to sustain the pretensions of the papal church in a momentous law-suit, were forged by the Spanish antiquary Medina Conde, and buried in the earth where he knew they would soon be discovered. The decretals called *the decretals of Isidore*, which formed the fundamental ground of the canon-law for eight centuries, were forged in the ninth century with a view to the maintenance of the papal authority. Isidore, archbishop of Seville, in whose name they were fabricated, died in 636.

Let us now descend to more modern times, and notice some of the most remarkable forgeries which they present to view. Precise chronological order in narrating them is not of consequence, and will not be sought.

The first which we shall mention are those executed by one Joseph Vella in the latter part of the last century, an account of which we transcribe from D'Israeli. The source from which this account is derived is not stated by D'Israeli; and we have not been able to discover it. In a French *Biographie Universelle* we find a narrative differing from his in some not very material points; but, as D'Israeli's is rather more circumstantial, we have chosen to rely on his authority. "One of the most extraordinary literary impostures was that of one Joseph Vella, who, in 1794, was an adventurer in Sicily, and pretended that he possessed seventeen of the lost books of Livy in Arabic. He had received this literary treasure, he said, from a Frenchman, who had purloined it from a shelf in St. Sophia's church at Constantinople. As many of the Greek and Roman classics have been translated by the Arabians, and many were first known in Europe in their Arabic dress, there was nothing improbable in one part of his story. He was urged to publish these long-desired books; and Lady Spencer, then in Italy, offered to defray the expenses. He had the effrontery, by way of specimen, to edit an Italian translation of the sixtieth book; but that book took up no more than one octavo page! A professor of oriental literature in Prussia introduced it into his work, never suspecting the fraud. It proved to be nothing more than the *Epitome of Florus*. He also gave out that he possessed a code which he had picked up in the Abbey of St. Martin, containing the ancient history of Sicily in the Arabic period, comprehending above 200 years, and of which ages their own historians were entirely deficient in knowledge. Vella declared he had a

genuine official correspondence between the Arabian governors of Sicily and their superiors in Africa, from the first landing of the Arabians in that island. Vella was now loaded with honors and pensions! It is true he showed Arabic MSS., which, however, did not contain a syllable of what he said. He pretended he was in continual correspondence with friends at Morocco and elsewhere. The king of Naples furnished him with money to assist his researches. Four volumes in quarto were at length published. Vella had the adroitness to change the Arabic MSS. he possessed, which entirely related to Mohammed, to matters relative to Sicily. He bestowed several weeks' labor to disfigure the whole, altering page for page, line for line, and word for word; but interspersed numberless dots, strokes, and flourishes, so that when he published a fac-simile, every one admired the learning of Vella, who could translate what no one else could read. He complained he had lost an eye in this minute labor; and every one thought his pension ought to have been increased. Every thing prospered about him except his eye; which some thought was not so bad neither. It was at length discovered by his blunders that the whole was a forgery, though it had now been patronized, translated, and extracted, throughout Europe. When this MS. was examined by an Orientalist, it was discovered to be nothing but a history of Mohammed and his family. Vella was condemned to imprisonment."

Captain Francis Wilford, an Englishman of great learning, was imposed upon in a most remarkable manner, while resident in India, by a Hindoo pundit in whom he trusted too implicitly. His deceptions consisted of the alteration of individual proper names in Indian MSS. which he produced, the substitution of new leaves for the original ones, (no very difficult matter, since Indian books are not bound like ours, but are only loosely connected leaves,) and, in one instance, the forgery of two voluminous sections, containing 12,000 Slocas or stanzas, which he pretended to have faithfully extracted from the Puranas, and which were composed in exact imitation of their usual style. Many of these forgeries were communicated to Sir W. Jones, who, with all his learning and philosophical caution, saw no reason to doubt their genuineness. Captain Wilford published in the series of volumes entitled, "*Asiatic Researches*," several extensive essays which were more or less imbued with error (one on Egypt especially,) from the reliance which he placed on this masterly imitator. The corrupted MSS. were preserved

by Captain Wilford, and some years after the deception was effected, he accidentally observed something peculiar in the appearance of the writing, which led him on, step by step, to a complete discovery of the imposition to which he had been subjected. His mortification, and his anxiety lest he should be regarded by the world as a participator in the fraud, threw him into a lingering disorder. As soon as possible he dispatched letters to his friends in various parts of Europe, making them acquainted with the facts, which he also published to the world soon after in a paper contained in the 8th Vol. of the *Asiatic Researches*. When our notable pundit was accused of the fraud, he immediately flew into apparent paroxysms of rage, imprecating the vengeance of heaven upon his head if he were not entirely innocent. Afraid that this conduct might not be adequate to reinstate him in the good opinion of Captain Wilford, he produced ten Brahmins as his compurgators, who swore by every thing sacred in their religion that no imposition had been committed. All was of no avail. Reprimanding the Brahmins for their perjury, Captain Wilford rid himself at once of them and the pundit whose fraud they had attempted to sustain.

All our readers without doubt know something respecting Lauder's temporary imposition upon the public relating to the originality of Milton's *Paradise Lost*. We propose to give a somewhat particular account of it, as minute details concerning it are not very generally accessible.

It was in 1747, that William Lauder first made his appearance before the world in the character of a detector of Milton's plagiarisms. In the beginning of that year he published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* with the initials of his name, W. L., a paper entitled: "Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns." Notwithstanding his pretended regret at his discovery, deep malice was apparent in the manner in which he urged and discussed the alleged obligation of Milton to other writers. This spirit induced a severity of inference on the part of Lauder far from being warranted by the circumstances asserted, even had they been true; and three several replies appeared in the columns of the same magazine, all admitting the truth of the facts presented, but resisting, we should rather say deprecating, the asperity of Lauder's deductions from them. Emboldened by this impunity, (for impunity it was comparatively, considering the actual extent of his criminality,) he, in the beginning of the year

1750, in accordance with a promise contained in the paper just mentioned, published a larger essay under the same title as the smaller, but in a volume by itself. This work was adorned with a preface and a postscript from the vigorous pen of the celebrated Dr. Johnson. Dr. Symmons, in his *Life of Milton*, states it as probable from Johnson's known connexion with Cave, the editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, that he was intimately concerned in Lauder's former essay ; but this is by no means satisfactorily evinced.

In the article and the volume of which we have spoken, Milton was accused of having derived many of his images and thoughts, and even many of his forms of expression, from Grotius, and several other modern writers, of little note in our day, whatever was their reputation in their own. The chief writers designated by Lauder, besides Grotius, were Masenius, a Jesuit, Taubmann, a German professor, and Staphorstius, a Dutch divine. To support his charge, he adduced passages, as from these writers, which did indeed bear a wonderful, a more than accidental, resemblance to passages pointed out in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and were sometimes completely identical with them, except that in the one case the passages were in Latin and in the other in English. On the strength of this correspondence, Lauder allowed himself the most unlimited abuse of Milton, terming him "an unlicensed plagiarist," accusing him of "an industrious concealment of his helps," of conduct "highly ungenerous," "absolutely unworthy of any man of probity and honor," "criminal to the last degree." "Mankind," says he, "by giving too implicit a faith to the bold assertion of our poet, that he sung *things unattempted yet*, have been deluded into a false opinion of Milton's being more an original author than any poet ever was before him. This opinion, and this only, has been the cause of that infinite tribute of veneration that has been paid him these sixty years past. Hence so many editions, translations, commentaries, lives, encomiums, marble busts, pictures, gold and silver medals." He attributed the well-known circumstance, that Milton would not teach his daughters to understand the languages which they were in the habit of reading to him, to his *fear that they would recognize his plagiarisms*. In conclusion of his treatise he made a solemn assertion of the purity of his motives and an apology for the severity of his remarks. The volume was inscribed to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

The facts which Lauder alleged were not disputed in print for a great while after their publication. Nor is this strange; for who could imagine that his book was an unmingled tissue of imposture. The very impudence of his enterprise protected him. His triumph was undisturbed for nearly a year. At the end of that period, however, the fine fabric he had constructed was dissipated to the winds, and he was degraded from the patronage and society of the great to his proper estimation; he became a thing at which general indignation and contempt were directed. In 1751, Dr. Douglas published a letter to the Earl of Bath, entitled "*Milton vindicated from the Charge of Plagiarism*," which, in a temperate but mercilessly thorough manner exposed the vile arts of Lauder, and rescued Milton's towering fame from his malicious assault.

The lines of Milton himself in the very poem so rancorously vilified, which describe the effect produced by the touch of Ithuriel's spear upon the visible form of Satan, as he sat "squat, like a toad, close at the ear of Eve," will not perhaps be regarded as entirely inapposite. Lauder was, we know,

"Blown up with high conceits, engendering pride.
Him thus intent Ithuriel with his spear
Touched lightly; for no falsehood can endure
Touch of celestial temper, but returns,
Of force, to its own likeness. Up he starts,
Discovered and surprised. As, when a spark
Lights on a heap of nitrous powder, laid
Fit for the tun, some magazine to store
Against a rumored war, the smutty grain,
With sudden blaze diffused, inflames the air;
So started up in his own shape the fiend."

Dr. Douglas was then rector of Eton Constantine in Shropshire, England. This letter was his first literary production. He died in 1807, bishop of Salisbury. When Lauder's book first came into his hands, and for a considerable time after its perusal, he, like others, did not once imagine it possible that the works referred to by Lauder wanted the passages ostensibly quoted from them; although he considered the deductions from the premises as unwarrantably harsh, and was ready to maintain, as he does in the first part of the letter which disclosed Lauder's fraud, that, even admitting all the premises, no inference could be drawn to Milton's discredit. In this idea he

was undoubtedly misled by his veneration for the great poet ; for nothing could be said in censure of any plagiarisms whatsoever, if we allow the character of innocence to those which Milton must have committed, had Lauder been veracious in his quotations.

In the summer of 1750, Dr. D. went to reside for a while at the University of Oxford. Curiosity, along with the unusual facility of gratifying it which his situation afforded, induced him to make search for the books to which Lauder referred. Many of them were so rare as not to be procurable even at Oxford. The two to which Lauder had made most frequent reference, that of Masenius and the *Adamus Exsul* of Grotius were not to be found. Those which he did obtain, however, revealed the imposition, probably unparalleled in point of hardihood, which Milton's detractor had practised upon the world. The first circumstance, which forcibly attracted Dr. D.'s attention, was that in every case Lauder omitted telling his readers *in what part* of the work to which reference was made the pretended quotation was to be found. This laid him under the necessity of turning over an entire volume page by page in order to find the lines alleged to be a citation.

Dr. Douglas's examination resulted in the disclosure that, of the lines adduced, those which bore any special resemblance to Milton's were invariably wanting in the original, and were therefore interpolated by Lauder. Dr. D. did not even leave Lauder the merit of having himself composed all the Latin verses that he had foisted into the productions which he pretended to quote with fairness. "The lines are good ones," says he, "and therefore let us give the honor of them to their real author." He discovered that nearly all of them were derived from a Latin translation of the *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*, executed by William Hogg, or Hogæus, as he calls himself on the title-page, and printed at London in 1690. Thus Milton was branded and reviled as a plagiarist *for having stolen from himself* ! "It seems so extremely improbable," says Dr. Douglas, "that any one should ever venture to put so gross an imposition on the world, that I almost despair of being believed, although *I know* the certainty of the fact."

Dr. Douglas also points out in Lauder's assertions many inconsistencies and extreme absurdities, such as always accompany very complicated deception. For example, he charged Milton with stealing the comparison of Eve to Pandora, in

Book IV. of *Par. Lost*, from *both* Masenius and Malapertius ; having undoubtedly forgotten, when he ascribed its origin to the latter, that he had already ascribed it to the former. In one part of his book he said, that the 11th and 12th Books of the *Par. Lost* were a copy of Rosse's *Virgilius Evangelizans* ; in another Du Bartas shares the honor of being their original ; and in another still, Barlaeus is said to have furnished "the *prima stamina* of the best part of the last two books of *Paradise Lost*."

The most amazing instance of effrontery in the whole tissue of his frauds is yet to be noticed. In his first essay, in the *Gentlemen's Magazine* of Feb. 1747, he *actually forged a passage for Milton himself*, and then asserted that it was an imitation of two lines which he adduced from Grotius and which are truly cited ! Such impudence is astounding ! The passage forged was as follows :

" And lakes of living sulphur ever flow,
And ample spaces."

When Dr. Douglas's Letter appeared, Lauder's booksellers at once told him, much to their honor, that he must either disprove the charges it contained, or they should publicly disclaim all further connexion with him. He unblushingly owned his fraud, and they circulated an advertisement declaring that before the publication of the exposure they had no knowledge of his dishonesty, and excusing themselves by saying, that the man's apparent incapacity to contrive such a scheme of deception had precluded suspicion.

Dr. Johnson *wrote for* Lauder a letter of contrition to Dr. Douglas, and forced its publication. It is said that this letter, which runs in a strain of extreme humility, by no means expressed the real feelings of Lauder at the time. At any rate, he subsequently retracted it ; and, three or four years later, published an additional pamphlet against Milton of the most malignant character. It produced no effect in his favor. He retired to Barbadoes in the West Indies, and died, about the year 1771, in merited poverty and obscurity.

The interest excited in the public mind by this imposture and its detection is well described by the celebrated bishop Warburton in a letter which we find in one of the volumes of *Nichols's Literary Anecdotes*. "Lauder has afforded much amusement for the public, and they are obliged to him. What

the public wants, or subsists on, is *news*. Milton was their reigning favorite; yet they took it well of a man they had never heard of before, to tell them the news of Milton being a thief and a plagiarist. When this was no longer news, they were equally delighted with another, as much a stranger to them, who entertained them with another piece of news, that *Lauder* was a plagiarist and *impostor*."

It should be noticed, that although Dr. D. first disclosed in print the facts relative to this imposition, the merit of the *first discovery*, as Dr. D. himself ingenuously states in his Letter, belongs to another, a Mr. Bowle of Oriel College, Oxford, who generously communicated to the former considerable aid in unmasking Milton's detractor.

The motives which led Lauder (how inappropriate a name! *lucus à non lucendo*,) to the perpetration of this bold fraud have never been ascertained; or, at least, if they have, they were exceedingly disproportionate to the danger and infamy of exposure. In the penitential letter to Dr. Douglas, he (or rather Dr. Johnson for him) assigns so puerile a reason for his conduct, that, it would seem, no considerate mind could for a moment suppose it the real one. In Nichols's Illustrations of the Literature of the Eighteenth Century there is a private letter of Lauder's to Dr. Mead, dated April 9th, 1751, in which he gives another and equally puerile account of the cause of his procedure, alleging a desire to retaliate on Milton for having attempted, as Milton's enemies have often asserted on no just grounds, to deprive Charles I. of the reputed authorship of the work called *Eikōn Basilikē*. The fictitious story to which Lauder referred is, that Milton stole a prayer from Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia, and, by means of "severe penalties and threatenings," compelled the printer of the *Eikōn Basilikē* to subjoin it to his majesty's production; intending to make the world believe that, as his majesty was not the author of that prayer, he was not the author of any portion of the book. "*Fallere fallentem non est fraus*," was Lauder's attempt at exculpation.

Dr. Johnson's connection with Lauder has been much harped upon by the enemies of that great man; and some of the facts in relation to it wear, it must be confessed, rather an undesirable aspect. Probably, however, he is not justly chargeable with anything more seriously derogatory than too great readiness to believe Lauder's assertions. This sprang from his well-

known distaste for Milton's politics, which has imparted undue severity to the criticisms on Milton's poetry which he presented to the readers of the Rambler, and led him to unfair estimation of Milton's character generally. As to the assertion of Sir John Hawkins in his memoirs of Dr. Johnson, that, while the sheets of Lauder's Essay were passing through the press, "Johnson seemed to exult in the persuasion that the reputation of Milton was likely to suffer by this discovery," although it has been pronounced by some a base calumny, we do not hesitate to admit the probability of its correctness ; for, with all Johnson's greatness of mind, he had a very remarkable degree of human frailty.

The poems of Ossian, presented to the world by Macpherson, are very generally regarded as an imposture. Chatterton's forgeries, also, have attracted great notice. Much mystery still adheres to them. D'Israeli declares that in his opinion the tale has been but half told. We refer thus cursorily to the supposed frauds of Macpherson and Chatterton because they were not long since discussed by the writer of an article in the North American Review, entitled "British Poetry during the latter part of the last century." If this Reviewer has erred at all, it is probably in respect to the extent of Macpherson's deception, and the error is far from being on the side of lenity. We are disposed to think that the so-called poems of Ossian are, for the most part at least, based upon poetical legends actually current in the highlands of Scotland, many of which were genuine productions of a bard named Ossian.

William Henry Ireland rendered himself notorious by attempting frauds upon the public in relation to the writings of Shakespeare. After disseminating several minor imitations, he became so completely demented as to endeavor to palm off an entire drama of his own composition as the production of the prince of English poets. A volume of the pretended relics appeared in 1798. We have not space to speak particularly of them. Suffice it to introduce some lines inscribed by the Rev. William Mason (author of *The English Garden*, *Elfrida*, and other poems) below a portrait of William Henry Ireland. The other forgers referred to in them are Lauder, Macpherson, and Chatterton.

"Four forgers born in one prolific age,
Much critical acumen did engage ;
The first was soon by doughty Douglas scared,
VOL. XI. No. 29. 8

Though Johnson would have screened him, had he dared ;
The next had all the cunning of a Scot ;
The third invention, genius, nay, what not ?
Fraud, now exhausted, only could dispense
To his fourth son their three fold impudence.”*

Many playful literary impositions have been practised upon the public and upon individuals, which are commonly set down as mere *jeux d'esprit*, deserving slight, if any, reprehension. A strict moralist, however, can hardly pronounce them innocent.

George Steevens, the commentator on Shakspeare, practised in the course of his very eccentric life, a great many impositions upon the credulity of antiquaries and weak-minded persons of all classes. They were, most of them at least, prompted rather by humor than by any malignant design. The famous story respecting the Upas tree of Java, “the effluvia of which, through a district of twelve or fourteen miles, had killed all vegetation, and had spread the skeletons of men and animals, affording a scene of melancholy beyond what poets have described or painters delineated,” is said to owe its origin to Steevens. He published it in the London Magazine as an extract from a Dutch traveller, in whose work, however, no one could ever discover it. The many fictions of this nature which appeared in the London papers during the literary career of Steevens are ascribed by many almost *en masse* to Steevens, from the fact that several have been satisfactorily traced to his pen.

The younger Scaliger was, as was his father likewise, of an arrogant disposition, and plumed himself much on his supposed infallibility of judgment concerning matters of ancient literature. Muretus, with a mischievous intent to expose him to ridicule, sent him some verses purporting to have been copied from an old MS. Scaliger was entrapped, and affirmed at once that they were written by an old comic author named Trabeus. He cited them as precious relics of antiquity in a commentary on Varro's work *De Re Rusticâ*. Muretus thereupon disclosed the deception, and Scaliger was deservedly humbled.

Horace Walpole, being at Paris in 1765, wrote a letter to Rousseau in French, purporting to come from Frederic, king of Prussia, which produced the effect anticipated by its author. The extravagant conduct of Rousseau, upon an occurrence

* The writer of these lines evidently had in mind Dryden's Epigram on Milton.

which keenly probed his singular vanity and self-consequence, afforded much amusement. Walpole, be it remembered, was the very man who spurned the unhappy Chatterton, upon discovering that the poems, which he published in the name of Rowley and other ancient writers, were written by himself.

If there was ever an innocent literary deception it was that of Mr. Burke in regard to his "Vindication of Natural Society," which bore on its title page the words: By a late noble Writer," meaning Lord Bolingbroke. So completely did he attain the intended similarity in thought and expression, that many of great sagacity admitted without hesitation the genuineness of the work, and some even praised it above Lord Bolingbroke's best performances. The production was ironical; it was designed to show that, on the same principles of reasoning which had been followed by the "noble writer" in the maintenance of his skepticism concerning Christianity, the expediency of political society might be disputed likewise. During the French Revolution, this same ironical composition of Burke's younger days was republished in England, as a piece of serious argument, by some of the admirers of those principles of anarchy under the venomous influence of which the French nation was then writhing in political convulsions.

The third general division of our subject relates to those who have published *intentional untruth*, as to the matters of fact which they state in their productions. We have already, however, extended our remarks to such a length as to preclude an examination of any of these frauds. In number and singularity they equal those which we have before noticed. That very extraordinary individual, George Psalmanazar, leads the host which enfilades before our mind's eye in view of this part of the subject of Literary Impostures. His autobiography is, we think, extremely entertaining, although D'Israeli pronounces it *tedious*.

A work on the literary impositions which have been perpetrated upon the public, besides being replete with interest, would be productive of considerable other advantage. It would furnish an important subject of study in the great science of human nature; exhibiting peculiar, cultivated specimens of criminality.

ARTICLE IV.

THE ADVANCEMENT OF BIBLICAL KNOWLEDGE.*

By E. P. Barrows, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Western Reserve College.

"ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness ; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." These are the words of an aged apostle, addressed to a youthful minister of Christ. The general truth which they assert is, that the holy Scriptures, given by inspiration of God, constitute a perfect rule for the direction of the christian teacher in all circumstances ; and that his perfection as a teacher consists in a perfect understanding of their principles, doctrines, and precepts. From the rich treasury of God's word, he is to furnish himself with sound doctrine for the illumination of the minds of those over whom the Holy Spirit has made him overseer ; from its bright and glorious principles, he is to convince men of sin, and put to silence gainsayers ; from its precepts, he is to reclaim offenders, rectify what is amiss in the church, and train up her members to holiness and usefulness. If the Scriptures of the Old Testament merited the high eulogium of the apostle, how much more the sacred canon as we now possess it, complete in all its parts, containing not only the writings of "Moses and the prophets," but also the words of Christ and his apostles ! Of this it may be said with emphasis, that the man of God who fully understands the truths which it embodies, and how to apply these truths skilfully to the wants of his people, is "perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" pertaining to his office.

The grand business, therefore, of every one who aspires to the work of the christian ministry, is to learn *what* truths the Scriptures contain, and *how* to apply these truths to the understandings and consciences of men. The former is accomplished by study ; the latter, mainly by practice. Both are indispensably necessary to constitute an efficient minister of the gospel ; "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." The present occasion, however, leads us

* This article was delivered by the author as an Inaugural Address. Ed.

to consider more particularly that branch of ministerial qualification which consists in a thorough acquaintance with God's word.

In pursuing this subject we shall inquire, first : What is involved in a thorough knowledge of Scripture ? and, secondly : How can this knowledge be most effectually diffused throughout the christian ministry ?

I. What does a thorough knowledge of Scripture involve ?

1. It involves a thorough acquaintance with the original languages of the sacred volume. This proposition, few, if any, will be inclined to dispute. We have a most excellent translation of the Scriptures into our vernacular tongue. For this inestimable boon we bless the God of our fathers. The sound learning and judgment of its authors, their freedom from a sectarian spirit, their scrupulous fidelity, and the majestic simplicity of their style are worthy of all praise. This translation we have ever been ready to defend against the cavils and inuendoes of superficial smatterers in sacred literature, and have felt that those sects, or fragments of sects, who find it in the way of their favorite dogmas, have a bad cause to maintain. Still, it is but a translation, and no translation, however perfect, can fully express all the delicate shades of meaning and connections of thought that belong to the original. Moreover, since its execution, biblical science has enjoyed the advantage of more than two centuries of investigation and research, in the progress of which much additional light has been elicited. In some few cases (not involving any fundamental doctrine or precept) it is generally admitted that the translators have erred ; in more still, the sense which they have expressed is one of two or more, either of which may be the true meaning of the original. Their "various readings" show that they themselves often hesitated as to the manner in which a particular word or phrase should be rendered. With all due deference, therefore, to these venerable men, we maintain that it is the duty of the man of God, to consult the original oracles of divine truth, and to judge for himself of their meaning. This was the doctrine of our pilgrim ancestors ; it has ever been the doctrine of their descendants to the present day ; and we mean to hand it down in its purity to our posterity.

2. A thorough knowledge of Scripture involves an acquaintance with the geography, and antiquities of ancient Palestine, and of the surrounding nations with whose history that of the

children of Israel is connected. The eager demand for this species of knowledge among the conductors of Sabbath schools, Bible classes, and others who desire to qualify themselves for the work of expounding the word of God to the rising generation, (a demand which has called forth some of the noblest intellectual efforts of the age,) is a commentary on its value which all can read and understand. Without the light which it affords, no one can clearly apprehend the force of the numerous allusions to the location and relative position of the cities and civil divisions of Palestine, and of the surrounding nations ; to their natural scenery, climate, and productions ; and to the manners and customs of society ; which crowd almost every page of inspiration. Who, for example, can intelligently read the narrative of the apostle Paul's journies and labors, without an acquaintance with the natural and civil geography of the regions over which he travelled ? Who, that does not understand the posture in which the ancients were accustomed to take their meals, can comprehend how "a certain woman" could stand at our Saviour's feet "*behind him*," while he was "at meat in the Pharisee's house," could wash his feet with her tears, wipe them with the hairs of her head, kiss them, and anoint them with ointment ? Who can fully understand the parable of the ten virgins without a knowledge of oriental nuptial ceremonies ? The above are a few obvious examples, selected from among many hundreds equally striking. Nor must the biblical student limit himself to the geography and antiquities of the Jews. In the course of their eventful history, the people of God were brought into contact with all the great monarchies of the ancient world, and from the geography and antiquities of all these are illustrations of Scripture to be sought. In the New Testament, more especially, Jewish, Grecian, and Roman geography and archaeology are all blended together, and are all indispensable to a full elucidation of the sacred page.

3. A thorough knowledge of Scripture involves an enlarged acquaintance with ancient history. We have remarked above that God in his providence brought his ancient people successively into contact with all the great monarchies of the earth. Let it be remembered that this was not for a day, or a month, or a year, but for long periods of time ; not when these monarchies were in their infancy, but when they were in their prime of glory and strength. It seems ever to have been Jehovah's plan to place his chosen people in the very heart of the

civilized world, a conspicuous object of attention to all the surrounding nations. To the north and east, they had the great Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian empires ; to the south, Egypt ; to the west, Greece and Rome. Thus, while God kept them constantly surrounded by the instruments of his pleasure, he made them, in turn, a spectacle to the world, whether in victory or defeat, whether exalted by his favor above their enemies, or sunk by his frown beneath their iron yoke. Hence the history of ancient Israel becomes the *leading element* in the history of mankind before the Messiah's advent, even as the history of the christian church is the leading element since that era. Take away this element from the annals of antiquity, and they are left, like the primeval chaos, "without form and void, and darkness is upon the face of the deep." Restore it, and all becomes order, harmony, and unity of design. We see one empire springing into existence at the fiat of Jehovah, that it may be the instrument in his hand of accomplishing some deep and glorious purpose respecting his church, and then sinking into its original nothing, to make room for another, destined, in like manner, to subserve the interests of Zion. It is no exaggeration to say that the record of God's dealings with his church is the key to the universal history of mankind ; and that her destinies are the hinge upon which the destinies of all nations have ever turned. Viewed in this light, how important does profane history become ! Isolated from sacred history, it is but a barren and disgusting detail of human passions and crimes ; but studied in connection with it, every page is luminous with instruction. What is it but a part and parcel of God's stupendous plan of subjecting all nations to the reign of the Messiah ?

Profane history, moreover, is *the key of prophecy*. How many predictions were uttered by the ancient prophets whose fulfilment is nowhere recorded in the Bible ! Many of these related to periods prior to the advent of Christ ; others have been accomplished since that day ; others, again, are yet future ; but the interpretation of all is to be sought from the page of uninspired history.

4. A thorough knowledge of Scripture involves an acquaintance with the internal history of the ancient world, that is, with its moral, religious, and political condition. The Mosaic economy was designed to be introductory to a nobler dispensation. Its perfection (the Holy Ghost being judge) was not *absolute*,

like the perfection of the Gospel, but *relative*, as a means to secure a further end, having reference to the existing circumstances of mankind. Whoever, therefore, would judge correctly of its provisions, must understand both the *final end* which it proposed to accomplish, the *means* which it selected for securing this end, and the *adaptation* of these means to the condition of the world. Many captious objections, for example, which have been urged against the policy which it prescribed with reference to the surrounding idolatrous nations, might have been spared, had their authors well understood the bearing of this policy upon the great end of this dispensation, which was to establish upon an immovable basis the doctrine of Jehovah's unity and infinite perfections, in opposition to the polytheism and image-worship that then prevailed throughout the world, that thus the way might be prepared for the introduction of the christian dispensation. The same remarks are, to a great extent, applicable to the New Testament. Without an acquaintance with the moral, religious, and political condition of the world at the period of our Saviour's advent, we cannot fully enter into the meaning of many passages which occur in the writings of the evangelists and apostles. For want of this knowledge, many a sincere inquirer after truth has felt himself greatly embarrassed and perplexed in the commencement of his investigations. But, as his acquaintance with the internal history of the ancient world has gradually increased, his difficulties one after another have vanished; light has succeeded to darkness, and order to confusion.

5. A thorough knowledge of Scripture involves an acquaintance with the laws of human language. For the Bible, though containing a revelation from God, is expressed in the ordinary language of common life, and is to be interpreted accordingly.

Whatever advantages we may imagine that we can secure to the cause of truth (or what we esteem the cause of truth) by deviating from the well established principles of interpretation which are employed in ascertaining the meaning of all other written documents, we shall find to our cost that, like the apocalyptic book, they are only sweet at the first taste. For one argument on the side of truth which can be thus wrested from Scripture, ten can, by the same method, be gained in behalf of error. How many forced constructions of the most simple passages of God's word would a rigid adherence to the laws of interpretation have prevented!—and how much angry logomachy!

6. A thorough knowledge of Scripture involves an acquaintance with the constitution of man considered as an intellectual and moral being. The word of God addresses itself to the whole complex nature of man, his understanding, his natural and moral susceptibilities, his powers of free agency. The more thoroughly, therefore, the minister of the gospel understands human nature, in the most enlarged sense of the term, the more clearly will he apprehend the great principles of revelation, which all address themselves to human nature; and the more skilfully will he be enabled to apply these principles in the interpretation of the inspired volume. There is a philosophy, "falsely so called," which "leads to bewilder, and dazzles to blind;" but true philosophy will always be found in perfect harmony with divine truth, for the book of the human mind, and the book of revelation, are both from God, and the one cannot contradict the other. We do not advocate the introduction of metaphysical subtleties into the pulpit. This is not their place. But we would have the man of God, when he enters the pulpit, understand the intellectual and moral constitution of the immortal minds upon which he is to operate. The more of this substantial philosophy he possesses, the better.

If, in the above attempt to show what is involved in a thorough knowledge of Scripture, we have not confined ourselves exclusively to the field of sacred literature, we hope we shall be pardoned for the digression. We wished to lay a foundation broad enough for the superstructure which we intend presently to rear upon it, and, in doing this, we could not well confine ourselves within the limits of any one branch of theological knowledge.

We cannot dismiss this part of our subject without adding that a right state of heart is indispensable to the successful study of Scripture. The Bible is not an abstract code of laws that can be examined with cool indifference, as one studies the laws of a foreign nation; nor is it a mere record of human transactions, like the histories of Greece and Rome. It is a code of laws indeed, but one which lays its broad claims upon the conscience of each individual who reads it, demanding of him instant and unreserved obedience: it is a history, but a history of God's proceedings with this apostate world, in which he has clearly developed the principles upon which he will deal with us through time and through eternity. It opposes itself directly to human pride and selfishness in every possible form; requiring

all to acknowledge their guilt and desert of eternal death, to submit themselves unreservedly to the authority of Christ, and to transfer their affections from earth to heaven. Is it not self-evident that the man who comes to the study of such a book, with a heart under the dominion of pride and earthly affections, will be constantly liable to err through the influence of passion and prejudice? How can he candidly examine and judge of a system of truth that comes into perpetual conflict with his daily habits and feelings? Men's hearts govern their heads, not their heads their hearts, as we may see every day illustrated in all the transactions of life. It was in view of this all-important truth that our Saviour uttered these memorable words, "If any man will do his" (God's) "will, he shall know of the doctrine," (which I preach) "whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. We find from experience that an obedient, humble, and devout state of mind, is an indispensable preparation for the successful investigation of truth. Let him who aspires to the office of the christian ministry bring to the study of the sacred oracles such a preparation; let him superadd all the subsidiary aids above enumerated; then, let him study the system of truth contained in the Holy Scriptures as one harmonious whole, endeavoring to see and understand the mutual connection and dependence of all its parts. Thus may he become "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

II. We come now to inquire, how a thorough knowledge of the holy Scriptures can be most effectually diffused throughout the ministry.

To this inquiry we reply, it is necessary, in the first place, that we should have some men in the church who shall press every department of biblical and theological learning to its utmost limits; and, in the second place, that the great body of the christian ministry should receive such an education as will enable them to avail themselves of the results of these investigations. This proposition divides itself into two parts, each of which will be separately considered.

1. We must have some men in the church who shall press every department of biblical and theological learning to its utmost limits. In no other way has any department of human knowledge ever been carried to a high degree of perfection. The splendid discoveries in the natural sciences which have so greatly enlarged the dominion of mind over matter, have, with scarce an exception, been made by men who were determined to

know all that could be known of that department of nature which they had selected as their field of investigation. The same remark holds true with respect to philology, history, geography, and archaeology in all its diversified forms. It is only narrow-minded ignorance that inquires, "Of what use is all this waste of precious time, of strength, and of intellect? this plunging into the arcana of nature? this squandering of years in poring over the musty records of antiquity? When there is so much to be done in the world, why not devote ourselves to pursuits of practical utility?" Aye, but how are we to ascertain beforehand the practical utility of knowledge? Did those who first began to inquire into the nature of steam know that their inquiries were to result in the production of the steam-engine? Some century and a half ago it might have been thought a very idle and unprofitable employment for a philosopher gravely to watch the effects of steam upon the lid of a tea-kettle, and to institute a series of laborious experiments for the purpose of ascertaining its properties. His neighbors might very naturally have rebuked him for wasting so much precious time in an investigation which could not possibly be of any advantage to the world; and that too at a period when the improvement of navigation, internal communication, and the mechanical arts presented such a wide field of profitable labor. But now, taught by experience, we have learned the folly of attempting to decide beforehand the practical value of knowledge. Were further illustrations needed, the history of modern science and literature would furnish them in great abundance. Nor is the history of biblical literature since the reformation less replete with instruction on this point. As its several departments have been, from time to time, advanced beyond their previous limits, new and unexpected light has been shed upon one portion after another of the sacred volume. Its great fundamental doctrines, written as with a sunbeam upon every page in characters so legible that "he who runs may read," have remained "without variableness or shadow of turning." But, while the doctrines themselves have continued immutable from generation to generation, many important illustrations of these doctrines, that needed the light of philology, or history, or geography, or archaeology, or which were involved in the mists of false philosophy and erroneous principles of interpretation, have been freed from the obscurity that rested upon them, and made to shine forth in the simplicity and beauty of truth, not indeed

establishing, but still greatly adorning, the fundamental doctrines of revelation. Even from those investigations that have been undertaken and prosecuted without immediate reference to divine truth, what unexpected light has sometimes been thrown upon some obscure passage, or some controverted point of scriptural history ! Of this the labors of the Champollions and their co-adjutors are an illustrious instance.

We trust enough has been said to show the importance of pushing every department of biblical knowledge to its utmost limits. But by whom shall this work be performed ? We answer, individuals must devote themselves to its several departments, according as their education, their native turn of mind, their station, and their means shall direct. It cannot be performed by the mass of the christian ministry, for they have not the requisite time and apparatus. Whoever hopes materially to enlarge the boundaries of any one of its branches, will need to devote to it many years of patient and laborious investigation. Take, for example, the department of Hebrew lexicography. The Hebrew has been for twenty-three centuries a dead language. In its words, in its grammatical inflections, and in its idioms it differs widely from the languages of Europe, ancient or modern. Moreover all the monuments of this language are comprised within the compass of one volume. Many words occur but once or twice, and then, oftentimes, in connections that throw little or no light upon their signification. The lexicographer who would contribute any thing valuable to this important department, must first carefully examine and collate the sacred text ; then, in difficult passages, he must consult the ancient versions and paraphrases ; where these fail to give satisfactory results, he must resort to a comparison of the cognate dialects, as the Aramaean, Arabic, and Ethiopic. How many years of study and research will this employment consume ! So the departments of ancient history, archaeology, etc., present immense fields of investigation, enough and more than enough to exhaust the energies of the man who aims at their permanent advancement. But though the prime of his strength be thus concentrated to a single point, let it not be supposed that it is either wasted or unprofitably spent. Those who are accustomed to estimate men's labors only by their immediate visible results, may speak lightly of him as a mere book-worm, a recluse that is of no service to mankind ; but the lovers of sacred learning will better appreciate his toils, and

he will have the satisfaction of knowing that while he has labored, other men will enter into his labors. There is no danger at the present day that any valuable discovery in sacred literature will be lost. Once registered on the printed page, it will become an advanced position from which others will push forward their investigations to a still further limit ; and their labors will become in turn the basis of future discoveries. Thus, each generation availing itself of the labors of its predecessors, and urging forward every department of sacred learning to its extreme limits, the most glorious results to the cause of truth, may be confidently anticipated.

2. The great body of the christian ministry must receive such an education as shall enable them to avail themselves of the results of the investigations of others. We shall here exclude the previous mental discipline which the academical course of study is designed to furnish, and speak only of that education which is strictly theological. With this limitation we would say that the education of which we speak must include a thorough introduction to the several departments of biblical and theological knowledge. This introduction will embrace an accurate acquaintance with the elementary principles, the modes of investigation, the sources of knowledge, and the means of deciding controverted points, that pertain to each. To these may be added more or less of its details, according as its nature, or the circumstances of the student may dictate. For an illustration of this position take the department of ancient history. Whoever would reap the benefit of the elaborate investigations of those who have devoted their lives to the study of this subject, must make himself familiar with all its great outlines, — the order and succession of the different monarchies with which the history of the Israelitish nation is connected, their relative position and political connections, and especially with the *synchronisms* of sacred and profane history ; with the sources of ancient history, and the principles upon which their comparative authority is to be determined ; and, finally, with various methods which learned men have proposed for reconciling contradictions either in chronology or in matters of fact. Then he will be prepared to avail himself of all the light which may from time to time be shed upon this department by the toils of others. Otherwise, his views will be so chaotic and confused that he can neither prosecute it himself to advantage

(unless indeed he is willing to commence anew) nor intelligently judge of the results of other men's labors.

For another illustration, take the department of language. The man who has made himself accurately acquainted with the original languages of Scripture is prepared intelligently to examine and judge of the results of the investigations of those who have devoted their lives to the subject. Otherwise these results can be of no service to him, except so far as he is willing to take the *ipse dixit* of the translator or commentator for truth. For the want of *three* years' training in the original languages of Scripture, he loses the fruit of *thirty* years of incessant toil and research; nay more, of the accumulated results of ages of investigation. Can any thing short of imperative necessity be admitted as an excuse for such negligence? Shall the candidate for the christian ministry be in such haste to do good that he cannot take time to qualify himself for the work? This looks to us very much like an army's leaving their artillery behind because of their haste to meet the enemy. Such a course, we admit, may in some extraordinary cases, be justifiable. There may be crises in which it is better to encounter the enemy with muskets and swords, than to lose time. So we have known cases in which it was our decided judgment that individuals should be commissioned to preach the gospel without any knowledge of the original languages of Scripture. But exceptions, be it remembered, do not constitute the rule. So far as our experience and observation go, those young men who make the most ado about losing time, most need to be kept back from the sacred office until they shall have had time to qualify themselves for its solemn responsibilities. Nor is it strange that it should be so, for it is an old adage that ignorance is the parent of self-confidence.

Here we wish to say a word respecting the Latin language as an aid to sacred literature. No part of the inspired volume is written in this language, and, for this reason, some have strenuously insisted upon banishing it, as a useless incumbrance from the circle of theological studies. To this we reply that the Latin tongue was for fifteen centuries identified with the history and literature of the church. It is the language of that people who, at the time of our Saviour's advent wielded the sceptre of the civilized world; the language of all the Western fathers; and, above all, the language of science, philosophy, and literature throughout Europe from the first introduction of

Christianity till the period of the reformation, and, to a great extent, throughout the whole of that mighty conflict of truth with error ; and that, as a necessary consequence, it embodies vast stores of theological learning of every kind, and is interwoven in ways innumerable, as well with the literature of the Bible, as with the history of Christianity. But it may be maintained in opposition to this argument, that all that is valuable in the Latin language for the purposes of theological learning has been transferred to the English language. To this we reply that the student who makes himself thoroughly acquainted with the Latin tongue and with the sacred learning which it embodies, will know that the assertion is grossly incorrect. While he is yet ignorant of the language, or only a superficial smatterer in it, he may be made to believe it, but not afterwards. Moreover, how is the student in theology to assure himself that the Latin tongue has thus been rifled of the accumulated treasures of ages, and left an empty shell ? When he sees year after year new and valuable translations from this into the English, it cannot be thought either strange or unreasonable that he should have some misgivings on the subject, and determine to examine and judge for himself.

It is freely conceded that many individuals, without a knowledge either of this or of any ancient language, have been eminently successful as preachers of the gospel, and that others, well versed in these languages, have been but feeble and inefficient ministers of the word. But the success of the former was attributable not to their ignorance, but to eminent ministerial qualifications in other respects, which were wanting in the latter. There is a tendency in some minds to draw unwarrantable general conclusions from two or three particular facts. They have known several instances of important enterprises commenced on Friday which terminated disastrously. They ascribe it to the day. Some of their neighbors who use alcohol have robust, others who use water, feeble constitutions. They are confident that the beverage makes all the difference.

Theological seminaries are not founded upon principles deduced from such narrow premises. The experience of eighteen centuries has shown that the efficiency of Christ's ambassadors, taken as a body, is proportioned to their piety and intelligence, and, furthermore, that nothing but intelligence can prevent even piety from degenerating into superstition and fanaticism. The demand for a thoroughly educated ministry has called these in-

stitutions into existence, and so long as this demand continues, they will be sustained. Experience will undoubtedly modify some of their provisions, but, if we rightly judge the signs of the times, these modifications will not consist either in abridging or excluding any of the departments of theological learning now taught in them, but rather in the introduction of more perfect methods of intellectual investigation and moral training. The question, how shall the spirit of active piety be maintained in vigorous exercise in the bosoms of theological students during the period of their education, so that the cultivation of their moral feelings may keep pace with the development of their intellectual faculties? — is one of vital importance, and is receiving, as it ought, the devout consideration of those who are called to preside over these schools of the prophets. In our Western seminaries the fields of activity which offer themselves to those who are in a course of training for the christian ministry are so many, and so accessible, that little difficulty is experienced, so far as external arrangements are concerned. Our young men can, if they will, find opportunities enough of doing good which do not interfere with the vigorous prosecution of their studies. If they suffer their christian affections to grow torpid for want of exercise, it is their own fault. What we have now said respecting the West will, we believe, upon careful inquiry, be found to hold true of all parts of the United States. If our theological students wish for *humble* opportunities of usefulness, they can be found every day in all places.

From these seminaries of the church, thus perfected by experience, the most cheering results may be anticipated. We may confidently hope that they will train up and send forth an army of young men thoroughly furnished to the work of the ministry, who shall know how successfully to wield the sword of the Spirit, for the demolition of Satan's empire. The present may be emphatically styled *the monumental era* of revelation. The record of the introduction of Christianity into this apostate world, of its mighty conflicts with the powers of darkness, and of the stupendous miracles which attested its divine origin, is now so incorporated into the history of mankind, that to efface it would be to blot out the annals of the world; so inseparably interwoven into the institutions of civilized nations, that to annihilate it would be to annihilate the whole fabric of society. It is spread out on the pages of antiquity, it is sculptured on monuments, it is impressed on coins and medals, it lifts up its

voice from the ruins of ancient cities and empires, it lives in the ordinances not only of the church, but of civil society, it speaks in tones of thunder from the progressive fulfilment of prophecy. The mountains and vallies of Palestine, its rivers, lakes and caves, its early and latter rain, its "snow and vapor and stormy wind," all bear witness to the oracles of God ; and the seed of Abraham are appointed by him to be the unwilling instruments of attesting their truth in all the nations of their sojourning. It is the duty of the christian ministry to understand and fall in with the grand designs of God's providence. It has pleased him, in these "latter days," to make the evidences of our holy religion (we speak of the external evidences) monumental in their character, and we must prepare to defend and advocate it upon this basis. This species of evidence does not indeed strike the senses so forcibly as miracles, nor is it so readily apprehended by the mass of the community ; but, to the candid inquirer it is not less satisfactory. At first it may appear dim and shadowy, but, in proportion as it is scrutinized, it gathers increasing brightness and force. It has nothing to fear from the light of truth ; ignorance and prejudice are its only enemies.

The history of the assaults which have been made upon revelation since the reformation is replete both with instruction and consolation. It has proved itself invulnerable on every point. Have its adversaries attempted to show that its doctrines are repugnant to natural religion ? God has raised up some one of his servants to demonstrate unanswerably the analogy between natural and revealed religion. Has philosophy, so called, held up to ridicule its peculiar doctrines as absurd and self contradictory ? A deeper philosophy has convicted it of uttering that which it understood not, things too wonderful for it, which it knew not. Have the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred canon been assailed ? The result has been to establish both upon an immovable basis. Has the future fulfilment of some one of the predictions of revelation been sneered at as a physical impossibility ? Even infidels, upon considerations independent of Scripture, have been led to presage the same event. Who, for example, with the knowledge which we now possess of the structure and constitution of the earth, will venture to sneer at the idea of a literal conflagration which shall envelop her, as in the twinkling of an eye, from pole to pole, destroying every vestige of her present organization ? Such has been the result of past efforts to shake the foundations of Christianity, and

such will be the result of future efforts. Meanwhile, as the process of investigation has been going on, one after another of the mists of error that had settled down upon her during the long night of the dark ages, has been dissipated, and she made to shine in a clearer and more resplendent light.

It has hitherto been Jehovah's plan to bring in at certain eras an overwhelming flood of light and truth to dazzle and confound his enemies. Such were the eras of the introduction of the Mosaic and of the christian dispensations; each of them bursting upon the world in all its brightness and glory at a period when the church was sunk into a state of the deepest depression. May we not hope that another such era began with the reformation and is steadily advancing towards the perfect day? an era not characterized, like the two former, by a series of stupendous interpositions of miraculous power, but by an irrepressible spirit of inquiry and research; a spirit which shall press every department of knowledge to its utmost boundaries; and which, when sanctified by the Spirit of God, and directed to the investigation of divine truth, shall under his guidance, separate from it the leaven of superstition and false philosophy, thus restoring it to its pristine sweetness and purity; and shall shed around the sacred volume such a lustre of evidence as shall sear the eye-balls of skepticism and infidelity, and drive them back to the bottomless pit whence they first ascended, leaving the everlasting gospel to the undisputed supremacy of the ransomed family of Adam.

ARTICLE V.

ON THE NATURE OF INSTINCT.

By Samuel Fish, M. D. Boston.

INSTINCT is a subject upon which a great deal has been said and written, and still we know so little what it is and upon what principles it operates, that we are scarcely wiser than we should be if it had never been discussed. While some have considered it a mere impulse exerted upon animals without their being conscious of it, others have exalted it to an equality with rea-

son—considered it reason—but reason of a lower grade than that which distinguishes the human species of a proper age from mere brute animals. It has generally been defined to be the power which determines the will of brutes ; or a desire or aversion acting in the mind without the intervention of reason or deliberation. While instinct has been considered a power which has been exerted without reflection, and as belonging mostly to brutes, reason has been considered the power by which we deduce one proposition from another, and as confined altogether to the human species. Brutes, by most philosophers, have been considered as actuated by nothing but instinct, and even the human species as actuated by no other principle in their infantile state.

Descartes and others after him, supposed that brutes were mere mechanical machines, having neither ideas nor sensation ; pleasure nor pain ; and that their cries and moanings under punishment, and adversity, when moved by an opposite impulse, are produced by the same sort of force, which when exerted upon the keys of an organ compels its respective pipes to give forth different sounds. Dr. Reid of modern times has espoused the doctrine of a mechanical principle, but differs from Descartes in supposing that the actions which are resolvable into this principle are of two kinds, those of instinct and those of habit.

Smellie and Dr. Darwin are in exact opposition to a mechanical force—to a corporeal hypothesis. They contend that instinct is a mental principle, and that brutes possess an intelligent faculty of the same nature, though more limited in its extent, than that of our own species. They are agreed in supposing that instinct is a mental effort, and therefore a faculty of reason, but differ by the former supposing that reason is the result of instinct, and the latter that instinct is the result of reason. Darwin recites many instances, with how much propriety those who read may judge, to show that the faculty which has been denominated instinct is in reality reason. An idea of his opinion, in general, may be inferred from the two following extracts from his *Zoönomy*. “By a due attention to these circumstances, many of the actions, which at first sight seemed only referable to an inexplicable instinct, will appear to have been acquired, like all other animal actions that are attended with consciousness, by repeated efforts of our muscles under the conduct of our sensations and desires.” “If it should be asked what induces a bird to

sit weeks on its first eggs unconscious that a brood of young ones will be the product? The answer will be that, it is the same passion that induces the human mother to hold her offspring whole nights and days in her arms, and press it to her bosom, unconscious of its future growth to sense and manhood, till observation or tradition have informed her."

Another set of philosophers have contended that instincts are of a mixed kind, holding an intermediate station between matter and mind; or that in some instances they are simply material, and in others simply mental. Cudworth, at the head of one division of these, from an attachment to the Platonic theory of the creation, an important principle of which is, that "incorporeal form," or "an active and plastic nature," exists throughout its wide domain, independently of pure mind and pure matter, supposed that instinct might be resolved into the operation of this secondary energy, in proportion to its existence in the universe. M. Buffon at the head of the second division of this class, not willing to accede altogether to the mechanical theory of Descartes, or to allot to animals below the rank of man the possession of an intelligent principle, permitted them to be possessed of the principle of life, and allowed them the faculty of distinguishing between pleasure and pain, with the possession of a desire for the former and an aversion for the latter. M. Reimen, a German professor, differing in some measure from this theory; divides the actions which he believes ought to pass under the name of instinct into three classes, mechanical, representative and spontaneous. Mechanical, he considers those actions of animal organs over which the will has no control, as the pulsations of the heart, the secretion of the bile, pancreatic juice, etc., and the dilatation of the pupil of the eye; representative, those which depend upon an imperfect memory, of which brutes are allowed to share in some small degree; and spontaneous, those which originate from M. Buffon's admitted faculty of distinguishing (in the brute creation) pleasure from pain, and the desire resulting from this distinguishing propensity of possessing the one and being freed from the other.

The great Cuvier supposes that instinct consists of ideas which do not originate from sensation, but which flow immediately from the brain and which are truly innate. "The understanding," says he "may have ideas without the aid of the senses; two thirds of the brute creation are moved by ideas which they do not owe to their sensations, but which flow immediately

from the brain. Instinct constitutes this order of phenomena ; it is composed of ideas truly innate, in which the senses have never had the smallest share."

A person who has attended to all these theories, and to all which has ever been written or said upon the subject, is but little wiser than when he commenced his investigations. Some of them, even those of men of great eminence in other respects, are too absurd not to be considered so by men of ordinary abilities. The most inconsistent theories are those which consider animals in the scale of beings next below man, to be mere machines, and to be moved by a mere mechanical impulse. Several other theories which have been mentioned are made up of a collection of inconsistencies, and unintelligible absurdities ; and a person attains no knowledge from attending to them. To obviate all the difficulty, and to give place to a theory upon a more rational hypothesis, M. Dupont of Nemours, France, in an article read before the National Institute, proposes to drop the term altogether, and further insists that there is no such thing as instinct ; and that every action which has been referred to such a faculty, originates from intelligence, thought, example, or from the association of ideas. This, it will be perceived, is a revival in a new form, of the theory of Smellie and Darwin.

Dr. Good, in his Book of Nature, which we have called considerably to our aid, after taking a general survey of the opinions and theories of other philosophers, comes to the conclusion that the principle of instinct never has been explicitly pointed out. After a few preliminary observations, he proposes to exhibit a new view, or a new theory upon the subject. He directs the attention to inorganic matter, which he has previously extensively spoken of ; particularly to some of the more prominent characters by which this is distinguished from organic matter, as a stone from a plant or an animal. The stone, he says, was produced fortuitously, formed by external accretion, and is only destructible by mechanical or chemical agencies. The plant, he observes, is produced by generation, brought forward in its growth by nutrition and by internal accretion, and rendered destructible by death. Animals differ from plants in a number of respects, but they are both characterized by a property which he terms *the principle of life*. "Life," says he, "or this mysterious or fugitive essence is a distinct principle from that of thought, and from that of sensation. Mr. John Hunter has traced it to many of the organized fluids as well as the

solids, especially to the blood. In every organized system, whether animal or vegetable, and in every part of such system, whether solid or fluid, may be traced that power, which with such propriety may be denominated *the principle of life*. Of its cause and nature we know no more than we know of the cause and nature of magnetism. It is neither essential mind, nor essential matter; it is neither passion nor sensation; though it is distinct from all these, it is capable of combining with any of them. It is possessed of its own book of laws, to which, under the same circumstances, it adheres without the smallest deviation.

The agency by which it operates, he says, is what should be denominated instinct, and its actions, when its sole and uniform aim is accomplished, instinctive actions. Instinct, whenever manifestly directing its operations to the health, preservation and reproduction of the living frame, or any part of the living frame, is the operation of *the living principle*. It is that power which characterizes and distinguishes organized from unorganized matter—pervades and regulates the former as gravitation pervades the latter, uniformly operating by definitive means in definitive circumstances, to the general welfare of the individual system on its separate organs; advances them to perfection, preserves them in it, or lays the foundation for their reproduction as the case may be.

It applies, according to the same theorist, equally to plants and to animals, and to every part of the plant and to every part of the animal, as long as the principle of life continues in them. It maintains from age to age the distinctive characters of plants and animals, carries off the waste or worn out matter, and supplies new—very often suggests the mode of cure when diseases and injuries have occurred or been inflicted, and even effects the cure itself. “It is,” continues he, “the divinity that stirs within us, and is the much noted ‘vis medicatrix naturae,’ of so many noted physicians.”

This is giving it an application so much more extensive than we have been accustomed to think it entitled to and as applied to it, and is linking and classifying actions together, so widely deviating from each other, especially in appearance, that we can with difficulty, even when we can conceive of nothing more plausible, persuade ourselves to afford it our assent. Instinct has generally, if we have not entertained wrong conceptions, been supposed to comprehend those actions only, which seemed

to arise, whether in the new born infant or in brute animals, from a voluntary motion. Such are the acts of the infant, when from some cause or other, it seeks nutriment from its mother's breast ; such are the acts of all the mammiferous animals in the same circumstances, the seeming anxiety of these to take care and preserve their young, with a great many other similar acts ; such are the actions of the feathered tribes to sit for weeks upon their eggs until they are hatched, and then to feed and brood over them until they are capable of taking care of themselves ; and such are a thousand acts of a similar kind in other animals, which it is unnecessary in this place to particularize.

With proper deference to a character so esteemed as a physician, so much admired as a professor, and so noted as an author, I shall venture to deviate from the above mentioned theorist, and prescribe narrower limits to the actions of instinct, and in some respects ascribe them to different faculties than those to which they have been usually considered as belonging.

To impart clear views, I shall follow still further the theory of Dr. Good, and afterwards commence the examination of the one just mentioned. At the conclusion of the first lecture of Dr. Good, he says that "instinct may be defined the operation of the principle of organized life by the exercise of certain natural powers directed to the present or future good of the individual ; and reason the operation of the principle of intellectual life, by the exercise of certain acquired powers directed to the same end." Towards the commencement of his other lecture, he says, "Instinct is the common law or property of organized matter, as gravitation is of unorganized ; and the former bears the same analogy to sensation and perception that the latter does to crystalization and chemical affinity. Instinct is the general faculty of the organized mass as gravitation is of the unorganized mass ; sensation and perception are peculiar powers or faculties appertaining to the second ; they can only exist under certain circumstances of the organized or unorganized matter to which they respectively belong. Gravitation belongs equally to the smallest portions of unorganized matter ; instinct in like manner belongs equally to the smallest portions of organized matter ; it exists alike in solids and fluids ; in the whole frame, and in every part of the frame ; in every organ and in every part of every organ, so long as the principle of life continues."

There might be some beauty, at least, and some propriety in such a theory, if the mind had not restricted it to narrower limits.

As the case is, it seems like breaking over barriers which nature had designed not to have broken over ; or like invading a country with a powerful force, when we had no right, or just cause. In the present essay, all those actions or motions which are performed without our being conscious of them, and which have been called involuntary motions, such as the action of the heart and arteries, the motion of the stomach and bowels, the secretion of the various fluids, the contraction and dilatation of the pupil of the eye, and many others of a like kind, will be left out of the catalogue of instinctive motions. The whole vegetable class of organized bodies, of course will be left out. This, it is believed, might with much more propriety, be arranged under some other name. There seems to be no better way of classing what are herein considered to be instinctive actions, than by taking those which in brute animals and in the new born infant *seem* to be performed, to a greater or less degree, through the intervention of the will. In respect to the former, there is no necessity of any further particularizing, and in regard to the latter, those acts only are thought of, which in after life, as far as they apply to the human species, are universally allowed to be performed through the intervention of the will, and as far as they apply to the brute creation, to what *appears* to be the will.

Smellie and Darwin, as before stated, have introduced a theory, in which they strangely contend, that brute animals and infants are actuated by the faculty of reasoning. This we shall not discuss very particularly. We shall not contend for it to any great extent, and we shall not exclude it altogether, considering it in every respect indefensible. Some of the actions, which we shall consider as belonging to instinct, are performed without reflection and without much seeming connection with it, and some through the intervention of what, if it is *not* reason, appears to be allied to reason. All instinctive motions call into action those muscles which are ordinarily considered to be under the control of the will.

Though instinctive actions—those considered such by Dr. Good, according to the limits above defined, have been considerably reduced, yet a number remain, and they consist of several kinds. In the account now to be given by them, we will begin with those which first present themselves in the new born infant, and other mammiferous animals. The first of any importance which here presents itself, is a nestling upon its mother's breast. This, it will be here observed, is not produc-

ced by a mere mechanical impulse, like what might be produced upon dead, inorganic, or disorganized matter, but from an impulse originating from proper and natural feelings—sensations and desires—such as present themselves, as well among brutes as human creatures, though with less acuteness in both, in after life. From a sense of hunger and inanition, in which there can be no mistake, desires are created after nourishment which occasion an uneasiness and nestling, and from a sense of smell, which from its never having been blunted or contaminated by obtuse and unnatural objects, is perhaps more acute than in subsequent life, its proper place, to a greater or less degree, is pointed out, and the infant, or the young of brutes is satisfied. A person who seriously and rationally takes this into consideration, can no more believe that it is performed without consciousness, than that at a later period of his existence he cannot tell what hunger, and agreeable and disagreeable odors are.

As age advances, there is a propensity with the child to laugh and play, and with the colt, the calf, the lamb to gambol and jump, which are healthful actions, and excited by a desire for exercise. If health prevails there is a glow of pleasurable sensations experienced, and an impulse occasioned by these, calculated to put in motion some of the various muscles provided for such purposes.

When the young are old enough, a different kind of food from that of the mother's milk is required, and the young of all animals, from natural desires, or from seeing others feed, or from both, partake of it themselves. New propensities and new desires develop and present themselves as age advances, and hence we see new intimacies forming, new joys and new pleasures experienced, and new engagements and new connections entered into. A new connection between the sexes takes place, but not without a peculiar sensation which directs to it, and an assurance that new pleasures will result from it. There is nothing inexplicable or wonderful in this, nothing but what we can readily account for, that is considering ourselves such beings as we are, and the mystery, that others have considered as belonging to instinctive actions, vanishes the moment they are taken up in their proper light. We know what our own feelings are in regard to these things, and we have no reason to suppose from what we every day behold, that there is any essential difference between our own feelings in these respects,

and those of brutes. We behold the latter provided with the senses of seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, feeling, just like ourselves ; we see them actuated by hunger and thirst, as we are ; provided with organs of reproduction, and apparently actuated by the same feelings in regard to the propensities belonging to these. They are possessed of a brain, a spinal chord, nerves originating from these and extending to the respective senses, and to all the different muscles. Why should they *not* be subject to pleasure and pain, desires and aversions, affections and antipathies like ourselves ? Why is there any thing more inexplicable and indefinable in things of a like nature, whether they belong to brutes or to ourselves ?

There seem to be feelings of pity, love, compassion, fear, and many other passions, belonging to brutes ; and why should it be otherwise ? They are endowed with flesh and blood, writhe and appear to be in agony when a wound is inflicted, grow lean when under the influence of disease and when food is withheld, and thrive and look plump when under opposite circumstances. We see them operated upon by anger, rage, hatred and revenge, as well as by the milder passions. If they are endowed with the same senses, the same desires and aversions, the same propensities and passions that man is, they are probably moved by the same impulses, all of which lead to similar results to what they do in ourselves, only in different degrees. In all these comparisons, the infant of our own species should be reckoned with brutes, because instinct has been supposed to apply to him much in the same way as to animals of the brute creation.

There are different actions in different orders, genera and species of brute animals, the peculiarities of which require particular notice. The dog barks, the cat mews, the lion roars, the horse neighs, which peculiarities are accounted for, upon the principle, that there is a peculiarity in their respective vocal organs, and in the muscles belonging to the respective brute animals which from the proper impulse are excited into action. We know not exactly what the feeling is that causes the dog to bark, but when we pay attention to the incidents that seem to be the cause of it, and to the peculiar sort of excitement that the animal at such a time exhibits, we can be at but little loss about it. It is not hunger that produces it ; it is not fear exactly ; it is not the same feeling that causes the fox to burrow, the rabbit to hide itself in the thicket, and the bird to fly to its

perch upon the tree. It is probably a different feeling from what any other animal experiences, but it may be similar to that which causes the ass to bray, or the hen to cackle. There is an excitement occasioned peculiar to that species of animals, and that excitement produces the effort that produces the note which we call a bark. If it was a cat, even supposing the sensation and the impulse were the same, the note or the tone of voice would be different, because the conformation of the particular apparatus is different. By alternately pressing upon the region of the lungs and desisting from pressure in a dead crow, the same hoarse note is produced, which it is accustomed to utter when alive. So that it is not the peculiarity of instinct and peculiarity of impulse, that produces the peculiarity of sound, but the particular conformation of the vocal organs.

The various feathered tribes, after having deposited their eggs in some convenient place, or in a nest formed with so much skill that the most finished artist of the human species cannot equal it, sit days and weeks without the smallest weariness or seeming impatience. Here is as complete a specimen of instinctive action as could be exhibited, and one which the disciples of Descartes would be as likely to consider mechanical as any of that class of actions. What but an unknown and inexplicable impulse, it may be asked, can induce these creatures to sit so long, when it is so unlikely, especially in the first instance, what the result will be? In regard to this being altogether unknown to them, there is some doubt. In regard to the reply to such a question, I can state without much hesitancy, that it is probably a similar impulse to that which induces the fond mother to watch over her infant babe and undergo so much solicitude for its welfare. From what has been stated, and from what is every day seen, it is evident that the brute creation are operated upon by passion—by love, fear, hatred, compassion, and many others of which we know ourselves to be possessed. Though there is nothing in the human species that exactly corresponds with the propensity or passion of the feathered tribes to sit whole weeks upon their eggs, yet there are propensities which are like it, and which might be readily perceived to be like it were we to pay scrupulous attention to the various affections belonging to the human race. It is no more strange that there should be such an affection in these animals, than that there should be love, love of offspring, in our own race. A person, after beholding with how much tenacity the hen sits

upon her eggs, must have but very little sagacity not to perceive that it is a passion, and a passion not altogether unlike what may be discovered in animals of a different order, and even among that order of which he is an individual member. We can more readily convince ourselves that it is a passion, than we can convince ourselves that it is reason, or altogether reason, for though the animal is so very solicitous to continue upon her nest, yet she knows not whether it is her own eggs she is sitting upon or those of a different species of the feathered race. Although she knows not, or appears to know not that it is her own eggs she is sitting upon, it argues not that she is altogether unconscious of what the result will be—unconscious that there will be a brood of young birds when she has set long enough. One thing more will be mentioned in regard to this, and that is, that though she appears not to have reason, she may in a slight degree be possessed of it, but from the ardor of the passion which induces her to be attached to her nest, reason is overpowered and drowned, as sometimes happens with individuals of the human race, when their anger gets the mastery. Cases are known, where the ardor of the hen has not perhaps arrived to its full height, in which, to change her eggs would cause her to forsake her nest.

It has been stated that there are several kinds of instinctive action. Those which present themselves in the young of mammiferous animals, as observed when they are nestling for their mother's milk, are one kind. Those of which we have just been speaking are another, and there are others still to be mentioned. The first are those which more immediately arise from sensation, the others from passion, and there are still others which may be supposed to originate from habit, or partly habit and partly passion. Ducks and geese have a strong propensity to swim upon the water, and that the propensity originates partly from habit may be inferred from the circumstance that they can be deprived of this indulgence without apparent detriment. It is passion, or a species of it, that actuates the dog to fly at and to hunt other animals. A similar propensity causes other animals, though ever so able to defend themselves, to flee from, or wish not to encounter the dog. It is passion, if it is not sensation, that influences the cat to watch for and catch mice and other pestiferous animals. One species of animals are actuated by one sort of impulse, and another species by another. It is natural for the hawk to watch for smaller birds, the fox to

watch for poultry, the wolf for sheep, etc. It is natural for some birds to migrate, for some to burrow and for some to swim upon the water. Sensation, passion, habit ; sometimes one, sometimes more, or the whole are the cause.

Besides these, there is another kind of instinct, if it is instinct, which is allied to reason, if it is not reason, when a horse upon coming where two or more roads centre, almost invariably takes that which will bring him to his home the quickest, the existence of a greater or less degree of reason must be supposed to actuate the animal. If a dog untold strives to protect a child from the danger which threatens it, it carries the idea that this creature has a portion of that faculty which is called reason. When a fox crosses and recrosses its track in order to puzzle the dog which is in pursuit of it, it shows that it has something of that ingredient which were it in man would be called reason. I have known a horse, when leading him, stop as suddenly for me to replace my portmanteau which had fallen from it, as though it had been man. I have known a dog, when a person had been making preparation to kill him, act as shy and endeavor to keep itself out of the way, almost as much as though it had been man. I have known a fox, while crossing a pond upon the ice, after coming to a weak place, feel as carefully as a person would feel if he were examining it, and instead of stepping upon it as it had done before, lie down and roll, to avoid breaking through. A thousand such things might be mentioned to show that brutes, if they have not reason, have something so nearly allied to it, that it scarcely deserves a separate name. The wisdom of the bee to construct its curiously-wrought checker-work for a depository for its honey, appears like reason, and it is probably reason combined with that particular propensity which causes the hen to sit whole weeks with the prospect in view of at a proper time beholding its infant progeny. The elephant, the beaver, the ant and many other creatures, are possessed of what, if it were beheld in the human species, would be called reason. That it is reason we will not pretend to decide, but should be glad to know in what respect it differs from reason. Some of the more unusual phenomena of instinctive action ought perhaps to be mentioned, but we know of none but what would come under one of the four heads of instinctive impulse which have been noticed. There is a species of animals which at a particular period collect in vast bodies, and after making all needful preparation start for

a given point, and whatever the impediments may be, continue in the same course without turning to the right or to the left, until they arrive at the place of their destination or perish in the attempt. This, from being uncommon, may appear irregular and perhaps to some inexplicable, but if due inquiries were made about it, they would doubtless meet with an easy explanation. We have not yet learned all the attributes of the animal world. Some are animals that have less senses than man, and there may be those that have more. If we knew what these were, we should not perhaps ascribe so much mystery to instances which we should not exhibit it in such a light as to confound the eyes of the wise. More might be said upon this subject, and more probably ought to be said, to evolve our theory from the facts which encompass it, but as a denser mist might place itself in its stead, we shall leave it where it is, hoping that if any light has been elicited, abler pens will be induced to continue the investigation and disencumber it from every thing that is mysterious.

ARTICLE VI.

FRATERNAL APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN CHURCHES, TO ENTER WITH A PLAN FOR CATHOLIC UNION ON AP- PROPRIATE PRINCIPLES.*

By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in
Semin. of Gen. Synod of the Lutheran church, Gettysburg, Pa.

*Πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, οὓς δέδωκάς
ἡμῖν ἐν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς.—JESUS.*

Εἰς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα.—PAUL.

WHEN the sincere and unsophisticated Christian contemplates the image of the church as delineated both in its the-

* It is proper to inform the readers, that the whole of this interesting article, and the substance of that which (Providence permitting) will appear in the April number of the Repository, and with the details of the Plan of Union were written about a year ago, and were fore prior to the excision of a portion of the Presbyterian church at its last General Assembly. This observation may be necessary to

practice by the Saviour and his apostles, he is charmed by the delightful spirit of unity and brotherly love by which it is characterized. When he hears the beloved disciple declare "God is love, and they that dwell in love dwell in God:" and again, "Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God, and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love:" and again, "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another—If any man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God, love his brother also."—When the Christian listens to such declarations as these, and numerous others of similar import; when forgetting things as they exist around him, he brings his whole soul under the influence of this love to God and the brethren; he perceives the moral beauty of these sentiments, and finds his heart vibrate in delightful unison with them. But when he awakes from this fascinating dream and beholds the body of Christ rent into different divisions, separately organized, professing different creeds, denouncing each other as in error, and often times, hating and being hated; his spirit is grieved within him, and he asks how can these things be among brethren? In the sacred record he looks in vain for the sectarian parties which

the misapprehension of some remarks, which might otherwise naturally be regarded as allusions to more recent events.

As a disciple of the common Saviour, the writer feels a sincere desire for the prosperity of every protestant fundamentally orthodox denomination, and for another "blessed Reformation" in the entire Romish church itself. As such, he feels it his privilege and duty to address a few ideas to his Protestant brethren generally, on the relations which do or ought to subsist between the different portions of Christ's kingdom. And he would respectfully and affectionately request them to test the sentiments advanced, not by their ecclesiastical standards, which are the work of uninspired though good men, but by the "law and the testimony," by the inspired rule of God's holy word. Let them solemnly inquire whether the Protestant churches organized and operating on the principles, fully developed in the next Number, would not approximate much nearer to the apostolic church, than they now do; whether they could not act much more efficiently and harmoniously in advancing the triumphs of the cross in the heathen and the papal world; and whether we might not even hope again to see the days, when surrounding observers will exclaim: "See how these Christians love one another?"

now constitute all that is seen of the church of the Redeemer ; he finds nothing there of Lutherans, of Presbyterians, of Methodists, of Episcopalians, of Baptists. But he sees that when the formation of such parties was attempted at Corinth, Paul deemed it necessary to write them a long letter, and besought them by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to have no divisions among them. The Christian is therefore constrained to mourn over the desolations of Zion and to meet the solemn inquiry, cannot a balm be found for the ulcerous divisions which deface the body of Christ ?

Many such hearts there happily are at the present day, which are relenting from the rigor of party organization and sectarian asperity. The love of Christ, that sacred flame which warms them, and bids them strive together for the conversion of a world, also melts down the walls of partition, which might well enough keep Jews asunder from Gentiles, but was never permitted to sever one Jew from another, and much less ought now to separate a Christian from his brother. Many are pondering these things in their hearts, and asking ought brethren to be thus estranged ? ought Ephraim thus to envy Judah, and Judah to vex Ephraim ? Their number too is multiplying. Brotherly love and christian liberality are on the whole progressive, and tender increasing facilities,—whilst they urge the imperious obligation of this inquiry upon every enlightened and sanctified intellect. Happily many of the ablest heads and noblest hearts in Christendom feel called to review *the ground, which the Protestant churches have been led to assume partly by option, partly by inconsideration, and partly by the coercion of circumstances.* The successful prosecution of this inquiry demands the casting off of the prejudices of education and long established habits, a recurrence to the elementary principles of Christianity, of christian doctrine, of christian government, of christian duty : and the men, be they ministers or be they laymen, who would regard this subject with indifference, or dismiss it with a sneer, may well inquire whether the love of Christ dwells in them. In this great concern not self-interest, but the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom, should be the motive of our actions ; not victory, but truth should be our aim.

In this incipient stage of our discussion, we would premise a few principles, or draw a few lines, by which the general course of our investigation may be recognized and the results in some degree be anticipated at which we shall arrive. It is admitted,

a) As one house cannot contain all the Christians in the world, or in a particular country, there must necessarily be *different houses* of worship.

b) As all Christians in a particular country cannot be incorporated into one congregation to enjoy the ordinances of the gospel, and to execute the duties of mutual edification, supervision and discipline ; there must be *different congregations*, as there were in the days of the apostles ; whatever may be the proper principle for their construction, and the proper bond for their union with each other.

c) We premise as a point conceded, that all the several denominations termed orthodox, which are but clusters of such different congregations, are parts of the true visible church of Christ ; because, in the conscientious judgment of all enlightened Christians, they hold the essentials of the gospel scheme of faith and practice ; and secondly, because the Saviour himself has acknowledged them as such by the seal of his grace and Spirit. " When James, Cephas and John perceived *the grace that was given to me*," says Paul, to the Galatians,* " they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship." And where is the bigot, who at the present day, would claim his to be the only true church, and thus repudiate all others as synagogues of Satan ?

d) As these denominations hold dissentient views on some nonessential points, it is demonstrable that all except one of them must entertain some error. For of two contrary opinions only one can be true. But the pretension that any one sect is right in all things, and all others in error so far as they diverge from this one, is highly improbable in itself, is forbidden by christian humility, by a knowledge of human nature, and by the amount of talent, learning and piety in all the several churches. Hence some error, in all probability, is an attribute of each sect.

e) Finally, we premise that ministers and laymen, though pious, are fallible, are sanctified but in part and liable to temptation from secular motives and feelings, even in things pertaining to the Redeemer's kingdom. Hence they are all under obligation to review their course of thought and action, and ought to be willing, for the glory of their God and Saviour, to retrace and amend whatever may be found amiss. This ob-

* Chap. 2: 9.

ligation devolves alike upon the writer and the reader. With a deep impression of its importance, its claims are urged on your present attention.

Under the presumption therefore that in these diversities of opinion we are all more or less in error, let us inquire whether it is right that the body of Christ should on account of these diversities be rent into so many different parts, under circumstances creating different interests in each, and strongly tending to alienate their affections, and dissolve that bond of fraternal love, by which they should be united, or whether it is the duty of Christians to endeavor to heal these divisions, and promote unity among all whom they profess to regard as disciples of Christ. The will of our divine Master will become apparent to us whilst we successively consider,

I. *The Scriptural injunctions.*

II. *The example of the apostles and primitive Christians.*

III. *The consequences which these divisions produce.*

In the wealthy and corrupt city of Corinth, a christian church had been planted by Paul, watered by the eloquent Apollos, and blessed by him, from whom alone can come any genuine increase. In this church, it seems, there appeared symptoms of the spirit of sectarianism, that spirit, "which now worketh" not only "among the children of disobedience," who have a name to live whilst they are dead ;" but which often mars the enjoyment and tarnishes the graces of the members of Christ's spiritual body. The Corinthian brethren had long been familiar with the several sects of heathen philosophers and religionists and by a natural transition were led to array themselves into parties according to some religious differences which arose among them. Some said "I am of Paul," probably because he first laid the foundation of the Corinthian church ;* others said "I am of Apollos," perhaps on account of his superior eloquence ; and others said "I am of Cephas," either because like Peter, they cherished Jewish predilections, or were converted by him elsewhere. Here then was an attempt to introduce different sects or religious denominations into the church of Christ, ranged under different leaders such as Paul, Apollos, Peter, Luther, Calvin, Zuingli or Wesley ; and what are the feelings of the noble-minded Paul ? Does he approve of such a course ? Let us hear his own words, my brethren, and pray that the spirit of our lacerated

* Chap. 3: 10. Acts 18: 11.

Master may enable us to understand them. "I beseech you, brethren, by the Lord Jesus Christ," (by the hope you cherish through him, by his suffering, by his blood), I beseech you, "that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms (*σχίσματα*) or sects among you ; but that ye be joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. For it hath been declared to me concerning you, my brethren, by them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions (*ἐριδεις*) among you : namely that every one of you saith," either "I am of Paul" (he is my leader), "or I am of Apollos, or I am of Peter, or I am of Christ. Is Christ," (i. e. the body of Christ) "divided? Was Paul" (or either of those whose names ye assume and whom ye wish to place at the side of Christ as leaders or heads of the church) "crucified for you? Or were ye baptized into the name of Paul (or of Apollos, or of Peter, so that ye were received into *their* church, and not into the church of *Christ*?) "I thank God," (since ye thus abuse the privilege of having been baptized) "that I baptized none of you except Crispus" (the ruler of the synagogue) "and Gaius" (whose hospitality I enjoyed whilst at Corinth;) so that ye cannot with any semblance of truth allege, that I baptized you in my own name and thus formed a peculiar sect of Christians.

Such is the powerful and decided testimony given by the inspired apostle Paul, against the spirit of sectarianism. Ought not every man who believes himself a Christian, to feel the force of this rebuke and ask, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do to heal thy wounded body? The apostle does not even introduce into his argument the points of diversity among them, on account of which they were arraying themselves into different parties. The simple facts that they were baptized into Christ, and into Christ alone, i. e. were members of the church in good standing, and that Christ must not be divided, are the only arguments which he deems requisite to prove the impropriety of their divisions and of their assumption of different names. He would have them Christians and nothing but Christians; not Pauline Christians, nor Apolline, nor Cephine, nor Lutheran, nor Calvinistic, nor Wesleyan Christians, not because he had any antipathy to Apollos or Peter; but because any such divisions based on difference of opinions or personal attachments naturally tended to rend asunder the body of Christ. Let it be distinctly remembered then, that the argument of Paul for the unity of the Redeemer's visible church is twofold; first, he maintains that this

unity and the impropriety of divisions on party-grounds are evidently presupposed by the fact, that all its members are baptized into the name of Christ alone ; and secondly from the fact that all divisions based on difference, are equivalent to dividing the one body of Christ. Nor does he here affix any limitations to these principles, and no uninspired authority is competent to prescribe any others than such as may indubitably flow from other inspired declarations or from the obvious nature of Christianity itself. The apostle Paul therefore distinctly forbids the cutting up of those whom he would acknowledge as Christians at all, into different parties or sects. And this he does even by anticipation, for in all probability, these parties had not yet fully separated from one another, nor renounced ecclesiastical inter-communion. Yet there were in the apostolic age, as well as at present, men who claimed to be Christians, but whom this great apostle was unwilling to acknowledge as such, and commanded " after the first and second admonition, to reject."*

In the passage, "A man that is a heretic (*αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον*) after the first and second admonition reject," the apostle himself limits the application of the principles above urged on the Corinthians, by showing that although he forbade the formation of sects or divisions among Christians on the ground of difference, yet there were occasionally persons in the church, who if incorrigible, deserved to be cast out of it altogether. The crime which in the judgment of Paul merited this punishment, he designates by the term *heretical* (*αἰρετικὸς*), which in the English language distinctly refers to one who denies a fundamental doctrine of Christianity. The original word also sometimes seems to have this sense ; but more frequently it signifies a schismatic, one who makes a division, or forms a sect. In the former acceptation, the passage inculcates the salutary duty, acknowledged and practised by all the orthodox churches of the land, of excluding from their communion and from membership, those who deny a *fundamental* doctrine of the gospel, that is a doctrine unitedly believed by all the orthodox churches, and regarded as essential by them. Some denominations would exercise still greater rigor, and exclude from their communion the believers of doctrines held by such sister churches, as they professedly and sincerely regard as churches of Christ. But Paul wholly repudiates those divisions grounded on diversity of

* Titus 3: 10.

sentiment, which would render it possible for a brother Christian, when ejected from one portion of the Saviour's church to find admission to another. At all events, the church in his day was not thus divided, and those whose excommunication he enjoined, must in his judgment have forfeited all claim to the christian profession. The apostles's rule, therefore, as limited by himself, would be that we ought not to separate from our brethren, for any error which we believe them to entertain, and which does not in our most conscientious judgment deprive them of all claim to the character of Christians.

The primitive import of the Greek word *αἵρεσις* (heresy) is *selection, choice*. Thus it is used by many ancient Greek writers. The following passage of Aeschines Socrat. (Dial. II. 3,) amounts, if not to a definition, yet to the most appropriate exemplification of this sense of the term: *εἰ δὲ τίς σοι διδόμη αἵρεσιν τουτοῖν, πότερον ἂν βούλοιο*, In this sense we also meet it in the Septuagint; (Lev. 27: 18 and 21,) as equivalent to *פָּדָה* free will, voluntarily. It is also employed to designate a *peculiar kind of discipline or mode of living*, that has been voluntarily assumed. But its more common signification* is *schism, division, sect*. Thus Dionys. Halic. (Ep. I. ad Ammaeum. c. 7.) says of Aristotle: He was not the leader or head of a school, nor did he form a *sect* of his own (*οὔτε σχολῆς ἡγούμενος, οὔτε ἰδίαν πεποιηκὼς αἵρεσιν*.) It is used by classic writers to designate the several philosophic sects, the Stoics, the Epicureans, the Peripatetics, etc. It occurs nine times in the New Testament and in the majority of cases it is translated *sect* in the common version. In the other cases it might with equal propriety be rendered in the same way,† as indeed it is by many distinguished translators. In its primitive and most current signification, therefore, the word (*αἵρεσις*) *conveys no reproach*. It is used to designate the sect of Pharisees,‡ the sect

* Rosenmüller defines *αἵρεσις* thus: "*Αἵρεσις* vox, per se media est. Ubi in malam partem sumitur significat idem quod *σχίσμα*; sed restringitur ad ea dissidea quae fiunt ex opinionum diversitate.

† 2 Pet. 2: 1. 1 Cor. 11: 9.

‡ Acts 15: 5: But there rose up certain of the *sect* (*αἵρεσις*) of the Pharisees, who believed saying, that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. Acts 25: 6: The Jews know me from the beginning if they would testify, that after the most straitest *sect* (*αἵρεσις*) of our religion, I lived a Pharisee.

of Sadducees,* and the sect of the Nazarenes or Christians.† In all the passages where it is rendered sect, in the common version, it signifies a party of persons who have separated themselves from others professedly pursuing the same end, over whom they profess to have some advantages. Here we have sects substantially corresponding to those of our days, sects based not on geographical lines, but on doctrinal diversities like our own, and yet what does Paul say concerning such sects in the church of Christ? Using the very same word by which he designated the sect of the Pharisees, (in an adjective form,) he declares: *Him that is a sectarian man* (αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον) an originator or supporter of sects in the christian church, after the first and second admonition, *reject*, exclude from your communion and intercourse, avoid. Here we have the apostle again distinctly condemning the formation of sects in the christian church, using the very identical term by which the Pharisees and Sadducees are designated in the New Testament and the several sects of their philosophers by classic Greeks.

Again, in the third chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians,‡ Paul denounces such divisions in the christian church as “carnal.” “For, (says he) whereas there is among you envying and strife and *divisions*, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith I am of Paul, and another I am of Apollos, are ye not *carnal*?” How then can divisions essentially similar, among modern Christians, be pleasing in the sight of God? In his letter to the Galatians,§ this same apostle classes these heresies or divisions among “the works of *the flesh*.” He beseeches the Romans,|| to “mark, (οἰκονεῖν) attentively to observe, or watch those, “who cause *divisions* and offences, contrary to the doctrine (or rather the instruction or advice) which ye have learned: and avoid them.” But it would be an endless work to present all the passages, in which the sacred volume inculcates the unity of the church, and deprecates its disruption into sects. Let one other passage terminate this branch of our argument. To the same Corinthians,¶

* Acts 5: 17: Then the high priest rose up and all they that were with him, which is the *sect* (αἵρεσις) of the Sadducees.

† Acts 24: 5, 14. 28: 22. ‡ v. 3: 4.

§ Gal. 5: 20: The works of the flesh are—wrath, strife, heresy, or sects, divisions.

|| 16: 17. ¶ 12: 12.

he says : " For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body ; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free ; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member but many.—Now they are many members, yet but one body—That *there should be no schism* in the body ; but that the members should have the same care one for another."* It would seem then to be irresistibly evident, that the unity of the church ought to be sacredly preserved by all who love the Lord Jesus ; and without stopping, at this stage of our investigation, to ascertain all the precise features of this unity, which will hereafter appear ; it is evident that the union inculcated by the apostle, is such, as is inconsistent with the divisions which he reprobates, and such divisions substantially are those of the present day, which are all based on some difference of doctrine, forms of government, or mode of worship among acknowledged Christians.

But the obligation of Christians to preserve the unity of the church, is evident from the *example of the apostles, of the apostolic and subsequent age*.

It would be superfluous to affirm, that no one of the apostles, or their fellow laborers established any sects in the christian church. The bare supposition of the contrary is absurd and revolting to every mind acquainted with the inspired record. Yet what ample ground was there for such a course, if it had been regarded lawful ? There was difference of opinion among the apostles, and difference among the first Christians : but neither was regarded as a cause for schism or division in the church. Paul differed from Peter and disapproved of his conduct so much that (he says) " at Antioch I withstood him to the face, for he was to be blamed : "† yet neither of them dreamed of forming a sect for the defence and propagation of his distinctive views. Paul and Barnabas differed about their arrangements for missionary operations, and when the contention grew sharp, each took as fellow laborers those whom he preferred, and thus prosecuted the work ; but it never entered into their minds to form different sects in the church. In the apostolic age there existed differences of *opinion* and *practice* between the Jewish and Gentile converts, far greater than those

* See also Eph. 4 : 3—6.

† Gal. 2: 11—14.

which divide some of the religious denominations of our land, (the former enjoining circumcision* and other ceremonial observances);† yet they did not divide the church into different sects under the guidance of the apostles. On the contrary the apostle enjoined mutual forbearance. “One man (says Paul) esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it—But why dost thou judge (condemn) thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought (despise) thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.‡ Nor did any schism actually arise from these differences till the apostles had gone to their rest, when in direct opposition to this advice, the Nazaraeans, in the reign of Adrian, separated from the body of Christians, who however strongly disapproved of their conduct. It is certain too that during several hundred years, there continued to be persons *in the church*, who exhibited a lingering attachment to the Mosaic ceremonial observances, yet they were not excluded nor advised to form themselves into a separate sect. The observance of the Lord’s day or christian Sabbath was universal;§ but some Christians during several cen-

* Acts 15 : 5.

† Gal. 4 : 10: Ye observe days and months and times and years. I am afraid, etc.

‡ Romans 14 : 5—10.

§ On the subject of the primitive sanctification of the first day of the week as the christian Sabbath it may not be uninteresting to adduce the testimony of Justin Martyr, who was born three or four years after the death of the apostle John, in his Apology for the Christians, presented to Antoninus Pius, A. D. 150. He says: “On the day which is called *Sunday*, all whether dwelling in the towns, or in the villages, hold meetings, and the *memoirs* (Ἀπομνημονεύματα) of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read as much as the time will permit; then the reader closing, the person presiding, in a speech exhorts and excites to an imitation of those excellent examples; then we all rise and pour forth united prayers, and when we close our prayers, as was before said, bread is brought forward, and wine and water; and the presiding officer utters prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability (ὅσην δύναμις ἂν ἔῃ) and the people respond by saying *Amen*. A distribution and participation of the things blessed, takes place to each one present, and to those absent it is sent

turies continued also to observe the Jewish Sabbath as a sacred day. The time for the observance of Easter was another point of difference and even of warm controversy ; yet excepting some intolerant individuals neither party seriously thought of dividing the church or disowning their brethren on this ground.* Had these differences existed in our time, who can doubt not only that separate sects would have grown out of them but that their formation would be approved by Christians generally ? Nay is not this question decided by facts ? Is there not a sect of some extent in our land, the Seventh Day Baptists, who dif-

by the deacons. Those who are prosperous and willing, give what they choose, each according to his own pleasure ; and what is collected is deposited with the presiding officer, and he carefully relieves the orphans and widows, and those who from sickness or other causes are needy, and also those that are in prison, and the strangers that are residing with us, and in short all that have need of help. *We all commonly hold our assemblies on SUNDAY, because it is the first day on which God changed the darkness and matter and framed the world ; and Jesus Christ our Saviour, on the same day, arose from the dead.*" Murdock's Mos. I. p. 164—5.

* The testimony of Eusebius on this point is very satisfactory. He says (Book V. chap. 23,) "there was a considerable discussion raised about this time in consequence of a difference of opinion respecting the observance of the festival (of the Saviour's) passover."—After narrating the history of this discussion and the efforts of Victor, bishop of Rome, to break communion with those who differed from him, Eusebius quotes an extract from a letter written by Irenaeus to Victor to persuade him to peace. "And though (says Irenaeus to Victor) they (the earlier bishops) themselves did not keep it, they were not the less at peace with those from churches where it was kept, whenever they came to them.—*Neither at any time did they cast off any, merely for the sake of form.* But those very presbyters before thee, who did not observe it, sent the eucharist to those of churches who did. And when the blessed Polycarp went to Rome, in the time of Anicetus, and they had a little difference among themselves, about other matters also, they were immediately reconciled, not disputing much with one another on this head. For Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp not to observe it ; because he had always observed it with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the apostles, with whom he associated.—Which things being so, *they communed together*, and in the church Anicetus yielded to Polycarp : they separated from each other in peace, all the church being at peace, both those that observe and those that did not observe, maintaining the peace." Euseb. Book V. chap. 24.

fer from other baptists only in regard to the time of observing the christian Sabbath ; they believing that the seventh day continues to be the proper one under the New Testament dispensation, as it was under the Old ? But in the apostolic churches it was different. There all who were regarded as Christians and lived in the same place, also belonged to the same church, and worshipped together, agreeing to differ in peace on minor points, and remembering that no Christian has a right to judge, that is to condemn his brother Christian on account of his conscientious difference of opinion. Each one was to be fully persuaded in his own mind, and prepare to stand with his brother before the judgment seat of Christ. Neither was to sit in judgment on the other, Christ was to judge both ; and until his final award their differences were to be borne in love.

Let it be borne in mind, then, that in the apostolic age, when the church was governed by inspired servants of God, and for some time after, there was not in the whole christian world any such thing as different sects of acknowledged Christians. All who professed to be Christians, and resided in the same place, belonged to the same church. And if, as was probably the case in large cities, they met at different houses for worship, they nevertheless all regarded each other as members of the same church or congregation ; they all frequently communed together, and the reason of different places for meeting, was not diversity of opinions among them, but because private houses in which they assembled, having had no churches till the third century,* could not contain them all. *Heretics* there were, who denied some essential doctrines of Christianity. These were excluded from the church in which they had resided, and were then disowned by all other christian churches. But different sects of Christians, acknowledging each other as Christians, yet separated on the ground of diversity of opinions, such as the different denominations of Protestants are, had no existence, and were utterly unknown in the apostolic age ; nor was the *great body* of the church ever thus cut up, in her purest day during the earlier centuries. We read of the church at Corinth, the church at Ephesus, the church in Rome, the church in Smyrna, the church in Thyatira, the church in Phil-

* The houses for christian worship were erected during the reign of Alexander Severus between A. D. 222—235 : yet Vater supposes them to have existed at the close of the 2d century.

adelphia, the church in Jerusalem, the church at Philippi, and in many other places ; but never of the *Pauline* church in Corinth, nor of the church that follows Apollos, nor of the church of Gentile converts, nor of the church of Jewish converts, nor of the church that retains the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, nor of the church that does not. In short *Christians* in those days were called Christians and nothing but Christians ; and one christian church was distinguished from another only by the name of the place in which it was located. This ought certainly to be a *solemn* fact to those, who have taken it for granted, that sectarian divisions of the church are right, that they were doing God service by their utmost efforts to perpetuate them, by inscribing on the tender and infant mind the lineaments of their denominational peculiarity. One thing does appear undeniable. If the sectarian form of Christianity be its best mode of development, the blessed Saviour himself—with reverence be it spoken !—the Saviour and his apostles failed to give it their injunction ; on the contrary, enjoined and practised directly the reverse !! The writer does not from these facts infer the obligation of Christians immediately to renounce their present organizations and all merge into one church. Difficulties now exist arising from honest diversity of views on church government, which did not exist in the apostolic age, and which render it impossible for persons thus differing to unite geographically ; but the essence of christian union may exist, and ought to be promoted immediately, as will be seen in a subsequent stage of this discussion. As to a union of all the churches of the land in one compact ecclesiastical system of judicature, such a one did not exist in the apostolic age, is undesirable, and dangerous.

But the importance of unity in the body of Christ, and the duty of promoting it is further demonstrated by the *baneful effects of sectarian divisions*.

Sectarian divisions, divisions on the ground of *difference*, tend to *destroy that community of interest, and sympathy of feeling* which the Saviour and his apostles so urgently inculcate. How fervently does our blessed Lord supplicate for the unity of all his followers ! “ Neither pray I for these (the apostles) alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word ; that they may all be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee”^{*}—that there may be among them that unity of counsel,

^{*} John 17: 20, 21.

of feeling, of purpose, of action which exists between the Father and the Son. What can be more reasonable? If all his disciples, all who "believe in him through the word," are hereafter to inhabit the same heaven, to surround the same throne of God and the Lamb; would not the principle of sectarian divisions carry discord into those harmonious ranks, and mar their heavenly hallelujahs and grate upon the ears of angels and the Lamb! No! sectarianism is an acknowledged and — alas that it should be so — a cherished trait of the church on earth, which will never, never be admitted into heaven. And who can doubt that the nearer we can bring the church on earth to the character of the church in heaven, the more pleasing will she be to him that purchased her with his blood. Accordingly Paul informs us: "That there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the *same care one for another*;"* and if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or if one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." But, gracious Lord! is not directly the reverse of this but too frequently witnessed? Does not the great mass of the several religious denominations of our land, exhibit any thing else than "the same care," for the other members of Christ's body? If one denomination suffers, fails of success or meets with disgrace in some unworthy members, do not surrounding denominations rather at least tacitly and cheerfully acquiesce if not rejoice, hoping that thus more room will be made and facility offered for their own enlargement? We do not find that members of the same family thus cordially acquiesce or triumph in each others' misfortune or disgrace. If one brother is visited by any calamity, if he falls a victim to intemperance and bears about in his bloated face the ensign of his disgrace, do we find his brothers and sisters rejoice in it? Do they not rather sympathize, feel hurt themselves, and mourn over his downfall? Thus ought it to be among all who deserve the name of Christ. Thus would it be, if the community of interest in the Saviour's family had not been impaired by sectarian divisions which place several distinct religious families on the same ground, with separate pecuniary interests, with conflicting prejudices, with rival sectarian aims! In the apostolic age and for centuries after it, only one christian church occupied the same field, and *thus three fourths of the causes which originate contention among*

* 1 Cor. 12:25.

modern Christians were avoided. These separate interests, will always create contention, rivalry and jealousies among fallible men, sanctified but in part, as long as they are not removed or their influence in some way counteracted. And, as they did not belong to the church constituted by the Saviour and his apostles, the solemn duty devolves on all Christians to inquire, how can this evil be remedied?

Again, sectarian divisions of the church *impede the impartial study of the sacred volume* by ministers and laymen. The doctrines believed by what are termed the orthodox churches, as well as their forms of government and worship, may be divided into two classes, those which are *undisputed* and held by all in common, and those which are *disputed* by some of them, and which distinguish the sects from each other. The sectarian principle builds a wall of defence around the peculiar opinions of each sect. It enlists all Christians in defence of the peculiarities of their denomination, and creates powerful motives of a self-interested and unholy character in vindication of these peculiarities, rather than of the grand truths of Christianity, which are essential to the salvation of all; motives which appeal to the pride of some, to the avarice of others, and to the ambition of a third class. Each member is taught by the very principles of his sinful nature to feel identified with the peculiar interests of his sect. His vanity is flattered by the supposed respectability of *his* sect, his ambition is at least tempted by the prospect of extended influence or distinction in the ministry or as a layman in the ecclesiastical councils of *his extensive and respectable* church, and his avarice is concerned in diminishing his own expenses by the increasing numbers of his fellow-members, or, if a minister, by the ample support which he may obtain. We would not insinuate that all Christians are influenced by these unamiable motives, nor that any true disciple of the Saviour is *mainly* actuated by them. But we fear that the majority of professors in the church, are more influenced by these secular considerations, than they are themselves aware. Accordingly, the peculiarities of sect acquire a factitious importance, are often inculcated with as much assiduity as the great and cardinal doctrines of the gospel. Endless and useless controversies about these points agitate the church, and disturb her peace. These peculiarities are instilled into the tender minds of children, and are often represented as involving the marrow of salvation. Prejudices are raised in their behalf. The tenets

of other denominations are often kept out of view, or stated in a manner but ill calculated for an impartial investigation of God's truth. The antipathies of the social circle are sometimes arrayed in opposition, and, may I say, sometimes in ridicule of other denominations; and even the gentler sex, sisters of her of Bethany, who, sitting at the Master's feet, imbibed the streams of his love; sisters of them, who, true to their affection,

"Were last at the cross,
And earliest at the grave,"

have hated that Saviour in the person of his followers, because they wore not the badge of their sect! have forgotten that their religion is love,—that charity, divine charity is the brightest ornament of their nature! Under such circumstances, doubts of the sectarian peculiarities inculcated, would expose the ingenuous youth who should avow them, to social inconveniences, to parental disapprobation, and rarely does he enjoy ample opportunity for impartial investigation, before adult age. The fact that almost invariably, young persons adopt and prefer the peculiar sectarian views of their parents, is a *demonstrative proof that their preference is not built on argument*, that the mode of religious education in the different churches is unfavorable to impartial investigation. The simple circumstance of parental belief, is assuredly no satisfactory proof of the creed which we adopt on account of it. For the same reason, we would have been Mohammedans, if born in Turkey, Papists in Italy, and worshippers of the Grand Lama in Thibet. And ministers of the gospel have still greater obstacles to surmount, as their disbelief of the peculiarities of their sect tarnishes their reputation with their associates, yea, not unfrequently excludes them from their pastoral charge, and their families from daily bread! Is it not evident, then, that the state of the christian church amongst us is unfavorable to the impartial study of the volume of divine truth?

Lastly, the principle of sectarian divisions *powerfully retards the spiritual conquests of Christianity over the world*. Who that knows aught of the divine life, can doubt, that in proportion as he permits pride, envy, jealousy, hatred to arise in his heart, the spirit of piety languishes, his graces decline and his sense of the divine presence is impaired? But sectarianism, by which in this discussion we generally mean the principle of divisions on the ground of difference, in nonessentials among those

who profess to regard each other as fellow Christians, sectarianism indubitably creates various conflicting interests, presents numerous occasions and temptations to envy, hatred, jealousy, slander, and creates an atmosphere around the Christian, in which the flame of piety cannot burn with lustre, and not unfrequently expires.

What observer of transpiring scenes can doubt, that the sectarian strife and animosity between the churches, deter many sinners from making religion the subject of their chief concern and from being converted to God? The Saviour prayed: That they all may be *one*, as thou Father art in me and I in thee; that they may also be one in us; *that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" Here then, the Saviour himself informs us what influence unity among his followers was designed to effect; history tells that when surrounding heathen were constrained to say "see how these Christians love one another," the moral influence of their example was amazing: and who can doubt that inverse causes produce inverse effects.

How often does not the principle of sect, exclude the blessed Saviour from our villages and sparsely populated sections of country, in which united Christians might support the gospel; but cut up into jealous and discordant sects, and hating one another as though each believed a different Christ, all remain destitute of the stated means of grace! The occasional visits of ministers of different sects serve to confirm each party in its own predilections, and thus we often witness the melancholy spectacle of the Saviour excluded from such places by the dissensions of his professed friends, and sinners shut out from the sanctuary of God because saints cannot agree whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas shall minister unto them.

Nor is the principle of sect, less *unfriendly to the spread of the gospel in heathen lands.* By often stationing on the same ground at home, more men than are necessary, or can be supported, laborers are improperly withdrawn from the destitute portions of the field, which is "the world;" conflicting interests unavoidably arise among the ministers and churches thus crowded together; as all cannot long continue, a struggle for existence is carried on, more or less openly, and with different degrees of violence, until the failure of one or more drives them from the field, and makes room for the others. Nor is this conflict to be attributed so much to the want of piety in the parties, as to that actual conflict of interests which unavoidably results

from the influence of sects. But certainly every true Christian must deplore this state of things, and it is the writer's deliberate conviction, that one of the bitterest ingredients in the cup of ministerial sorrow, in many portions of our land, is this unholy and unhappy strife among brothers. In short it is a solemn and mournful truth, that sectarianism, the principle of sect, in a great measure changes the direction in which the energies of the church are applied, *transfers the seat of war from pagan to christian lands*, from the territory of Christ's enemies into the very family of his friends! In the beginning the church of the Redeemer at peace at home, directed all her surplus energies against the world around her and the world of Jews and Gentiles in foreign lands. The war was waged not by one portion of Christ's family against another, but emphatically and distinctly by the church against the world; such was the almighty force of the spiritual artillery wielded in this holy war, that in about three hundred years the little band of fishermen and tentmakers, fought their way to the utmost bounds of the Roman empire, and the banner of king Jesus, which was first unfurled in the valleys of Judea, was waving in triumph o'er the palace of the Caesars. But who can deny, that a large portion of the energies of christian sects is now expended in contending with each other, in building up walls of partition, in fortifying and defending those peculiar views by which they are kept asunder? The war is no longer a foreign, it is an intestine one. How large a portion of the *periodical literature* of the day is occupied in these family feuds, and consists of mere "doubtful disputations!" How large a portion of *ministerial talent* is placed in requisition to sustain this conflict? How many precious hours of time are thus applied? If all the time and talent and effort spent by the orthodox protestant churches in disputing with one another about the points of their difference, since the blessed Reformation, had been devoted to the projects of benevolent enterprise for the unconverted heathen world, who can calculate the progress that might have been made in evangelizing the gentile nations? Let every true disciple of the Saviour inquire, why do 600 millions of our fellow men languish in the shadows of death eighteen hundred years after the blessed gospel has been entrusted to christian hands for them? Four and fifty times has the entire population of the globe been swept into eternity, since the Saviour commissioned his disciples to publish the glad tidings to every crea-

ture. Who that has witnessed the prompt and overwhelming blessing of God on the efforts of the little band of Christians in Europe and America during the last thirty years ; who that has seen a nation new-created almost in a day in the isles of the Pacific, and witnessed the standard of the cross erected in Africa, in Greece, in Turkey, in Hindoostan, in Ceylon, in China and many other places ; and the glorious gospel of the Son of God translated into about one hundred and fifty languages ; who that reflects on the millions of Bibles and the tens of millions of tracts which the united bands of liberal minded Christians have sent forth, can doubt that if the christian church had not become secularized by the unhappy union with the civil government under Constantine in the fourth century, the world had long ago been evangelized. Or if the Protestant church had not been split into so many parties by adopting the new, and we must believe unauthorized and pernicious doctrine, that they *had a right to adopt* for themselves and require of others as terms of communion, not only the fundamental doctrines which were required in the earlier centuries and were supposed sufficient for hundreds of years after the apostolic age, but also *as many additional and disputed points as they pleased*, thus dividing the body of Christ and creating internal dissensions ; who that is acquainted with her history can doubt that greater, far greater, inroads would have been made into the dominions of the papal beast, and the glorious gospel of the Son of God, in the three centuries since the Reformation, have been carried to the ends of the earth.

Such then being the mournful consequences of that disunion against which the Saviour and his apostles so urgently admonished their followers, we feel with double force, that the church has been guilty of suicidal error, and that it is the solemn duty of every friend of Jesus, sincerely to inquire, Lord what wouldst thou have me do to heal the wounds of thy dismembered body !

Deeply impressed with the conviction, that the blessed Saviour and his apostles have explicitly inhibited the division of the body of Christ into sectarian parties or factions, and fully persuaded that these divisions which exist among Protestants generally, *at least with their present concomitants*, are highly prejudicial to the prosperity of Zion ; let us approach the inquiry, *what is the more immediate and specific nature of that*

union, which characterized the primitive church, and which it is obligatory on us to promote. As Protestants, who are ready to exclaim with Chillingworth, "*the Bible, the Bible*" is the only infallible source of our religion; we must naturally turn our eyes to its sacred pages; nor can we with safety rely on the practice of the church in any subsequent age, except in so far as it accords with apostolical example, or at least is a manifest development of principles clearly inculcated in the gospel. It is indeed worthy of remark, that we know next to nothing of the history of the christian church during more than a hundred years after its first establishment, except what is contained in the New Testament. This has often been regretted by men; but God has doubtless designedly enveloped that early period of her uninspired history in darkness, to compel us to rest entirely on his own infallible word, and to draw a clear and broad line of distinction between the authority of his inspired servants and that of the fathers of the church in after ages. The history and practice of the earlier ages when known, may afford an occasional illustration of our subject; yet, as protestants, we can acknowledge nothing as essential to the character of the church, or the duties of her members, which is not distinctly contained in the sacred volume.

It is certain, that *this union did not consist in any compact ecclesiastical organization of the entire church in a nation or empire under one supreme judicatory.*

Excepting an occasional interposition of apostolical authority, we are informed, that each church attended to its own affairs of government and discipline. Addressing the Corinthians,* Paul says "Do not ye judge (*κρίνετε*) them that are within? Therefore put ye away (*ἐξάγατε*) from among yourselves that wicked person;" manifestly attributing to the Corinthians the right to discipline and exclude an unworthy member from their body. The same right of supervision and discipline over her members, is attributed to each individual church by the Saviour himself:† "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone"—and eventually, if other means should fail, "*tell it to the church.*" Nor do we find in either of these cases any ultimate reference to a judicatory consisting of representatives from several, much less from all other chris-

* 1 Cor. 5: 12.

† Matt. 18: 15—17. See also 2 Cor. 2: 7.

tian churches. The phraseology* of the New Testament evidently implies, that each church was a distinct and complete church and a member of the body of Christ. It is however equally certain, that the New Testament presents in addition to several minor consultations, one example of a council or synod,† whose members were "the apostles, elders (that is, preachers), and brethren (that is, lay members)," and who assembled at Jerusalem for the purpose of settling a dispute touching the obligation of christian converts to observe "the law of Moses, etc." This synod was convened for a special purpose, was a *pro re nata* convention, and although it fully sanctions the call of such meetings as often as necessary, and justifies a provision for stated meetings if experience establishes their necessity and utility; yet it cannot with any plausibility be alleged, that the churches were then regularly united into such synods, or that such meetings were held regularly, at fixed times. Had they been of annual recurrence, who can doubt that some trace of the fact, or allusion to it, would be found in the Acts of the apostles or the epistles of Paul, which cover a period of about thirty years, and narrate or allude to the prominent events in the history of the church during that period? These facts urge upon our attention several important positions, the value of which will be more evident in the sequel. They are these:

a) *That the divine Head of the church has intrusted the great mass of the duties and privileges of his kingdom to the individual churches in their primary capacity.* Hence, though the churches ought to take counsel with each other, and for this purpose may have *stated meetings*, and constitute *regular synods*, they should not suffer any encroachments on their rights, nor permit too much of their business to be transacted by these *delegated* associations or presbyteries or synods. The neglect of this caution gradually robbed the churches of their rights and liberties in past ages, and fostered that incubus of Christianity, the papal hierarchy at Rome.

b) *The duty of fraternal consultation and union of counsel ought not to be neglected by the church in the discharge of her duties.* This principle evidently affords sanction to the various associations among the churches such as presbyteries, sy-

* Gal. 1: 2. 1 Cor. 16: 1. 2 Cor. 8: 1. 1 Thess. 2: 14. Acts. 9: 31. 15: 41.

† Acts xv.

nods, etc., for the purposes of mutual counsel, encouragement and coöperation in the performance of such duties as can best be accomplished by conjunction of means and efforts. Yet the history of past ages distinctly admonishes us to beware of the natural tendency to consolidation in church as well as State. There is doubtless danger of the concentration of power in the hands of ecclesiastical judicatories, which has in former ages, alas ! been but too frequently abused to purposes of oppression and bloodshed, to the destruction of liberty of conscience, and the obstruction of the Redeemer's spiritual kingdom. It appears inexpedient for the churches to devolve on their delegated judicatories, such duties as they can perform as well in their primary capacity for another reason ; because, when duties of various kinds are accumulated on any individual bodies, they must necessarily be less able to discharge them all with efficiency.

It is evident then, that in the apostolic age, the unity of the church did not consist in a compact conjunction of all her parts in an ecclesiastical judicatory. On the contrary, we have no accounts of any synods or councils after that age, until the latter part of the second century. Eusebius, the earliest author by whom the transactions of these councils are recorded, uses the following language, from which it is highly probable that such councils were nothing new, and that similar ones had been occasionally held during the previous seventy-five years which had intervened since the death of the last apostle :* “ About this time appeared Novatus, a presbyter of the church of Rome, and a man elated with haughtiness against those (that had fall-

* Euseb. Book 6. chapter 43. Ἐπειδὴ περ τῇ κατὰ τούτων ἀρθείς ἐπερηθανία Νοουάτος τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας πρεσβύτερος, ὡς μὲν αὐτοῖς σωτηρίας ἐλπίδος, μὴδ' εἰ πάντα τὰ εἰς ἐπιστροφὴν γνησίαν καὶ καθαρὰν ἐξομολόγησιν ἐπιτιλοῖεν, ἰδίας αἰρέσεως τῶν κατὰ λογισμοῦ φροσίνων καθαρούς ἑαυτοὺς ἀποφηνάντων, ἀρχηγὸς καθίσταται. ἐφ' ᾧ συνόδου μεγίστης ἐπὶ Ῥώμης συγκροτηθείσης, ἐξήκοντα μὲν τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐπισκόπων, πλείονων δὲ ἔτι μᾶλλον πρεσβυτέρων τε καὶ διακόνων, ἰδίως τε κατὰ τὰς λοιπὰς ἐπαρχίας τῶν κατὰ χώραν ποιμένων περὶ τοῦ πρακτέου διασκευαμένων, δόγμα παρίσταται τοῖς πᾶσι· Τὸν μὲν Νοουάτον ἅμα τοῖς αὐτῷ συνεπαρθεῖσι, τοὺς τε συνευδοκεῖν τῇ μισαδίλφῳ καὶ ἀπανδρωποτάτῃ γνώμῃ ἑ ἀνδρὸς προαιφρομένους, ἐν ἁλλοτριόις τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡγείσθαι· τοὺς δὲ τῇ συμφερᾷ περιπεπτωκότας τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ἰᾶσθαι καὶ θεραπεύειν τοῖς τῆς μετανοίας φαρμάκοις. Edit. Zimmermann, Vol. I. p. 464, 465.

en), as if there were no room for them to hope for salvation, not even if they performed all things which belong to a genuine conversion, and a pure confession. He thus became the leader of the peculiar sect of those, who inflated by vain imaginations, called themselves Cathari. A very large council being held at Rome on this account, at which sixty bishops and a still greater number of presbyters and deacons were present, and the pastors of the remaining provinces, having according to their location deliberated separately what should be done; this decree was passed by all: That Novatus and those who so arrogantly united with him, and those that had chosen to adopt the uncharitable and most inhuman opinion of the man, should be ranked among such as are aliens from the church (excluded); but that such of the brethren, as had fallen during the calamity (persecution), should be treated and healed with the remedies of repentance."

This is the earliest account extant of any regular synod after the apostolic age. The absence of even the least intimation, that this assembly was any thing novel, confers a high degree of probability on the supposition that other similar meetings had occasionally occurred before. But it was not until the close of the second, or beginning of the third century, that these associations began to hold *regular* and *stated meetings*. This practice was first introduced in Greece, where the popular mind had been familiarized to such stated representative conventions, by the Amphictionic Council, and would naturally be inclined to transfer to the church, what had proved so acceptable in State.* Still the introduction of regular stated meetings had to encounter some opposition, for Tertullian, in the commencement of the third century, found it necessary to undertake their defence.† By the middle of the third century, however, these stated annual meetings had become very general.‡ Lay representatives

* See Neander's Kirchengeschichte, Vol. I. p. 322. Tertullian's words are, "Aguntur per *Graecias* illa *certis in locis* concilia, ex universis ecclesiis, per quae et altiora quaeque in commune tractantur et ipsa representatio totius nominis Christiani magna veneratione celebratur." De Jejunia, c. 13.

† "Ista solennia, quibus tunc praesens patrocinatus est Sermo."—Tertullian.

‡ Cyprian. Ep. 40. and Firmilianus, (apud Cyprian. Ep. 75.) of Cappadocia: Necessario apud nos fit, ut per singulos annos seniores et praepositi in unum conveniamus, ad disponenda ea quae curae nostrae commissa sunt. Neander sup. cit. p. 322.

were at first admitted to these councils, as the "brethren" evidently had been in the apostolic age; but in process of time the bishops secured all this power to themselves.* These conventions were merely provincial, and embraced the churches of only one particular country or province. The entire christian church was not yet united by any supreme judicatory, having jurisdiction over all its parts, as eventually occurred under the papal hierarchy; but here we find for the first time a visible *union of all the acknowledged churches in a particular country under one ecclesiastical judicatory*. Such an extensive union in one judicatory, could not long fail to abridge freedom of investigation and liberty of conscience; if its powers were not purely those of an *advisory council*, and its advice confined to matters originating between the smaller judicatories and contemplating their relation to each other, and the progress of the church in general.

Again, the primitive unity of the church of Christ did not consist in *the organization of the whole church on earth under one visible head, such as the pope at Rome and the papal hierarchy*. We shall not here stop to prove, that the power given alike by the Saviour to all the apostles,† could not confer any peculiar authority on Peter: nor that Peter's having professed the doctrine of the Saviour's Messiahship, on which the Lord founded his church, does not prove that he founded it on Peter himself, making him and his successors his vicars upon earth. It is admitted by all Protestants that the pope is a creature as utterly unknown to the Bible as is the Grand Lama of the Tartars. It is well known, that the papal hierarchy is the gradual production of many centuries of corruption. In the third century the churches of a particular kingdom or province, were united by provincial synods; but it remained for the ardent African bishop Cyprian, after the middle of the third century, by an unhappy confusion of the visible with the invisible church, to develope in all its lineaments the theory of a neces-

* Neander sup. cit. p. 324.

† Matt. 16: 19: And I will give unto thee (Peter v. 18) the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Chap. 18: 1, 18: At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, etc.—He said—Verily I say unto you (disciples v. 1) whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.

sary visible union of the whole church on earth in one uniform external organization, under a definite apostolic succession of bishops, as the essential channel of the Spirit's influences on earth, transmitted by ordination.* It is only under the influence of this confused theory, that enlightened and good men could believe in the impossibility of salvation without the pales of their own visible church ! That such a man as *Augustine*, could advance the following sentiments in the official epistle of the Synod assembled at Cirra in the year 412 : *Quisquis ab hac catholica ecclesia fuerit separatus, quantumlibet laudabiliter se vivere existimet, hoc solo scelere, quod a Christi unitate disjunctus est, non habebit vitam, sed ira Dei manet super ipsum. Quisquis autem in ecclesia bene vixerit, nihil ei praejudicant aliena peccata, quia unusquisque in ea proprium onus portabit, et quicumque in ea corpus Christi manducaverit indigne, iudicium sibi manducat et bibit, quo satis ostendit apostolus, quia non alteri manducat sed sibi*—communio malorum non maculat aliquem participatione sacramentorum, sed consensione factorum.† And in his own work “*De fide et symbolo*,” written about twenty years earlier, he says :‡ “*We believe that the church is both holy and universal (i. e. one). The heretics, however, also denominate their congregations churches. But they, by entertaining false views concerning God, do violence to the christian faith : the schismatics on the other hand, although they agree with us in doctrine, forsake brotherly love by creating pernicious divisions.*”

It is easily perceptible, how this erroneous idea of the necessary visible combination of all the churches under one organiza-

* Neander's Kirchengeschichte, Vol. I. p. 330, 331.

† Fuch's Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen, Vol. III. p. 303. “Whoever separates himself from this universal church, however praiseworthy he may suppose his general conduct to be, shall not obtain life on account of *this crime alone*, that he is separated from the unity of Christ, but *the wrath of God abideth on him*. But whoever leads an exemplary life in the church, shall not be injured by the sins of others, because in it (the church) every one shall bear his own burden, and whoever eateth the body of Christ unworthily, shall eat and drink judgment to himself, by which the apostle clearly shows, that as he eats not for another, but for himself,—it is not the communion with the wicked in the reception of the sacraments, which contaminates any one, but his assent to their evil deeds.”

‡ Koepler's Bibliothek der Kirchenvater, Vol. IV. p. 240.

tion, as the supposed exclusive channel of the divine influence and favor, would naturally tend to facilitate the ultimate adoption of the papal hierarchy ; for here, and here alone, in the holy father, is to be found one visible, tangible head, adapted to the one universal visible church. That this opinion however, was not that of the apostles or of the apostolic age, is confirmed by the concurrent testimony of all writers in the earlier centuries. On this subject an interesting testimony has reached us in the Apostolic Canons, so called because the work professes to be and in the main is a collection of the principal customs and regulations for the government, discipline, etc. of the christian church during the first four centuries from the days of the apostles. It was most probably compiled shortly after the time of Augustine, in the middle of the fifth century, and clearly proves that the exclusive pretensions of the bishop of Rome were not acknowledged even at that time : It reads thus :

Canon 33. The bishops of each nation should know the principal one among them, and regard him as their head (τους επισκοπους εκαστου εθνους ειδεναι χρη τον εν αυτοις πρωτον, και ηγεισθαι αυτον ως κεφαλην) and undertake nothing of importance without his advice. But each one should himself attend to what belongs to his own church and neighborhood. But even he ought to do nothing without consultation with others (αλλα μηδε εκεινος ανευ της παντων γνωμης ποιειτω τε). Herein consists the true unity (of the church), and such a course will tend to the glory of God through Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit."

In short it is well known, that the bishop of Rome did not obtain even the title of *universal bishop* until, in the seventh century, "Boniface III. engaged Phocas, the Grecian Emperor, who waded to the throne through the blood of Mauritius, to take from the bishop of Constantinople the title of *oecumenical* or *universal bishop*, and to confer it on the Roman pontiff." His dignity as a *temporal prince* he did not receive till in the eighth century, when the usurper *Pepin*, in consideration of the aid afforded him by the pontiff in treasonably dethroning his predecessor, granted "the exarchate of Ravenna, and Pentapolis" to the Roman pontiff, and his successors in the pretended apostolic see of St. Peter. There can therefore be no question as to the truth of our position, that the primitive church was not united under one visible head, such as the pope and papal hierarchy.

Finally, it is certain that the unity of the primitive church did not consist in absolute unanimity in religious sentiments. This assertion may appear startling to some. "What!" (some of my readers may be ready to exclaim) "was there any diversity of opinion in the primitive church, under apostolic guidance? we have always supposed, that there existed a perfect agreement on all points among the first Christians, and that the proper method to restore the primitive purity of the church is to insist on agreement on all points from those who could unite with us as a church of Christ." This opinion has also prevailed for many centuries, and has been the prolific mother of extensive and incalculable evils in the christian church. It has led to the persecution and death of millions of our fellow men under the papal dominion, it has caused endless divisions and envyings and strife in the Protestant churches.

Its fallacy we think appears from the following considerations :

It is rendered highly probable by the fact that the Scriptures contain no provision to PRESERVE absolute unity of sentiment on all points of religious doctrines and worship if it ever had existed. Many points of doctrine and forms which men at present regard as important, are not decided at all in the sacred volume. Other points are inculcated in indefinite language, which admits of several constructions. The diversity of views derived from these records by the several religious denominations of equal piety, of equal talent and equal sincerity, indisputably establishes the fact, that they do not contain provision for absolute unity of sentiment among Christians. Now as all admit the substantial similarity of the oral instructions of the apostles to the primitive Christians, and their written instructions in the sacred volume, it follows that the impressions made on an audience of primitive Christians would be the same ; except perhaps in the case of a few individuals who might have opportunity of personal interviews and more minute inquiry with the apostles. With the greatest facility the Author of our holy religion could have made such provision. He did by inspiration endow his apostles with every requisite qualification not naturally possessed by them, and led them into all necessary truth. Now as they have left many points of doctrine and forms of worship and government undecided, and as they do not express with philosophical precision the doctrines which they do teach, it is a just inference that one reason why these minor differences are not obviated in the church, and all truly pious, able and faithful Christians do

not agree on all points is, that the sacred volume has not made provision for such absolute unanimity. Let no one here assert that human language is so deficient, and the education and habits of men so diverse, that they will impose different constructions on any composition. The contrary is the case. Even uninspired men of well disciplined mind, have often expressed their views on these topics in language which is not misunderstood. Is there any doubt, in any well informed mind, as to the opinions taught on the several topics which separate the principal protestant churches, by Calvin in his *Institutes*, or by Whitby on the *Five Points*? In regard to the meaning of some protestant creeds there has been, it is true, not a little controversy. But the framers of these Confessions designedly used language somewhat generic and indefinite, in order that persons of not entirely accordant sentiments might sign them, and modern disputants of each party have endeavored to prove these creeds favorable only to their own views. Or, persons charged with deviation from an adopted creed, and believing themselves to adhere to its general tenor, are naturally inclined to interpret its indefinite or generic terms in favor of their own views, whilst their opponents, pursuing a contrary course, strain those same expressions as far as possible in a different direction. But it will not be denied, that it would be no difficult task for any well educated divine to make, in a single octavo page, such a statement of doctrines, as would distinguish any one of the prominent protestant denominations from all others,—to frame a creed, concerning whose real meaning, there would be no difference of opinion. Therefore, as the written instructions of the apostles and other inspired writers, do not contain provision to produce absolute unanimity among the pious since the apostolic age, and as these very written instructions were addressed to the primitive Christians, and were the only inspired instructions which many of them possessed; there can be but little doubt, that if a dozen of those Christians had been required to state their views on all the points of diversity between protestant Christians, it would have been found, that the impressions then made by these books, were not more definite than those which they now produce on the same points of doctrine. And as the oral teaching of the apostles was doubtless substantially the same as their recorded instructions; the impression made by them on the entire primitive church was probably the same so far as doctrines are concerned; whilst it is evident, that in re-

gard to the apostles' mode of worship and church government, there could have been but one opinion, among those who had witnessed them with their own eyes. Again, the fact that the Bible is not constituted so as to obviate this diversity of sentiment, when it might easily have been so formed by the hand of inspiration, is *conclusive proof that the points of diversity among real and enlightened Christians, are not and cannot be of essential importance.*

But the existence of *diversity of opinion in the apostolic churches is placed beyond all possible doubt by the express declaration of the apostle Paul*, who, knowing that such differences would continue to exist in after ages, has also prescribed regulations for our conduct towards those who may differ from us: * "Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye but not (in order) to (engage in) disputations with him about doubtful matters. For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth; for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth.—One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it to the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.—But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ."

Here then we have the express testimony of the apostle, that differences of opinion did exist among the primitive Christians at Rome in reference to at least two points, the diversity of meats and the question whether all days should be regarded as equally holy, or whether the Jewish distinction of days should be observed by Christians. Both the points of difference are moreover of such a character, relating to matters of fact, tangible and visible in their nature, that any regulation which the apostle may have previously given, Christians would be aided in comprehending, by observing the example and practice of the apostles themselves. They were matters too concerning

* Rom. 14: 1—13.

one of which he had seven years before expressed his opinion in pretty evident language to the Galatian brethren, when he said : * “ How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage ? Ye observe days and months and times and years ; I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.” And how does the apostle settle this dispute among the Romans ? How does he introduce perfect unity of sentiment among them on this point of christian duty ? It is worthy of special observation, that he does not even attempt to induce them all to think alike ; but enjoins on each one obedience to the dictates of his own conscience, and on all abstinence from every attempt to condemn or censure their brethren for honest difference of opinion ; he enjoins on all mutual forbearance and brotherly unity ! Be it remembered too, that this point of difference among the primitive Christians,† is one, on which the declarations of the New Testament have produced pretty general unanimity among modern protestant Christians, whilst it is a matter of historical notoriety that the diversity on this very topic was not entirely banished from the primitive church a century after all the books of the New Testament which touch on the subject had been written.

Again, look at the church of Corinth itself, whose attempts at division Paul so decidedly censured. The apostle explicitly informs us, that some members of the Corinthian church *denied the resurrection of the body*. As to the reason of their denial, whether the leaven of the Sadducees had infected them, or whether, as Greeks, they were misled by their philosophy falsely so called, and with Celsus despised the doctrine as “ the hope of worms,” the *ἐλπίς σκωληκῶν*, we know not ; but for the fact Paul is our authority. “ How,” he remarks, “ say *some among you*, that there is no resurrection of the dead ?” He then advances several arguments in favor of the doctrine, answers the philosophical objections to it, and proves to them the fallacy of their opinion on this subject ; but not the least intimation is given, that those who believe in the resurrection should separate from those who denied it. This doctrine had

* Gal. 4: 10.

† According to the earliest records extant the difference in the time of celebrating Easter is referred to the apostles themselves. See Dr. Murdock's Mosheim I. 102, 103. 164.

not, it is true, been so amply unfolded by any inspired writer as is done by Paul in his epistle to these very men, and we are unable to perceive how any believer in the Scriptures could now deny this doctrine. Yet the fact of the resurrection, to say nothing of the Old Testament, had been distinctly affirmed by the Saviour and his apostles, as must have been known to the Corinthians.

It is therefore absolutely certain that the bond of primitive union, was not that of perfect unity of sentiment on religious subjects even in the days of the apostles themselves. That differences on other topics, especially on minor points of abstract doctrine, also existed, is evident from the fact expressly declared, that some even went so far as to fall into fundamental doctrinal error, such as to "deny the Lord that bought them." Now every rational man will admit, that the progress of the human mind in the fluctuation of opinions is gradual, and that where the extremes occurred the intermediate gradations must have existed. It seems almost impossible for a mind elevated but a single grade above savageism, when for example the doctrine was taught that Christ made an atonement for sinners, not to advert to the persons for whom this atonement was made, and to understand the declarations of the gospel as teaching, that it was made for somebody, either for all men or a portion of mankind. But although we have no reason to imagine that the same books which are differently understood by modern Christians, could have produced absolute unity of opinion among them; we find no certain traces of *dissension* about points of *abstract* doctrine. As these abstract differences had no perceptible influence on christian practice, the primitive Christians probably did not even compare their views on many points of modern controversy, and may have differed on some minor topics without knowing it. Yet on some points they differed and discussed; but Paul dissuades them from indulging in "doubtful disputations."*

Having thus, as we suppose, satisfactorily ascertained, that the bond of union among the apostolic churches did *not consist in a compact ecclesiastical organization of the entire church in any nation or country under one supreme judicatory*; nor in the

* Rom. 14: 1: Him that is weak in the faith (who has not fully apprehended all the christian doctrines) receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations (*μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν*, without deciding on his scruples).

organization of the whole church on earth under one visible head, such as the pope and papal hierarchy ; and finally, that it did not consist in absolute unanimity of religious sentiment ; it remains for us to inquire into the positive elements which did compose it—whilst each congregation transacted its ordinary business of government and discipline for itself, and constituted as it were one member of the body of Christ, what were the ties by which these several members were united together, and by which the spirit of brotherly love was preserved among them ?

We here presuppose the prevalence among the primitive Christians of that unity of spirit, which gave life and value to all the external forms of union. Without this, the church, even if externally bound together by a bond of iron, would be a lifeless trunk destitute of that pervading spirit that gives interest and animation to the whole. But on this subject we are not permitted to cherish a moment's doubt. We are expressly told by Luke in his Acts of the Apostles:* "*And the multitude of them that believed, were of one heart and of one soul.*" Then it was that the disciples continued "with one accord, breaking bread from house to house, and did eat their meat with gladness and with singleness of heart, praising God and having favor with the people."† It is this unity of spirit, this undissembled brotherly love, cherished in their bosoms and manifested in their conduct towards each other, which invested the example of the primitive church with such an omnipotence of moral power, and extorted from the surrounding heathen themselves the exclamation : "See how these Christians love one another." But our object at this time is to ascertain, what were the principal external means of manifesting and perpetuating this unity of spirit among the primitive christian churches.

I. The first means of union was *entire unity of name* ; that is, the careful avoidance of all names, which implied difference or division. In the apostolic age, the followers of the Redeemer were technically called *Christians*, and only Christians. The churches in different places were distinguished by *geographical* designations, and by these alone. We read of the church at Jerusalem, the church at Corinth, the church at Rome, etc. but not of the Pauline or Apolline or Cephine church, nor of a church named after any other person but him, who bought

* Acts 4:32.

† Acts 2:46.

the church—not a part of the church, but the *whole* church, with his blood. Let it not be supposed, that this is an unimportant feature of christian union. Paul the apostle did not thus regard it, when he so promptly met and repelled the attempt of those at Corinth, who adopted such sectarian names, saying “I am of Paul and I am of Apollas and I am of Cephas.” He expressly forbade their adoption of such names, declaring that by so doing they implied, that their adopted leaders had died for them, and that they had been baptized into *their* names. The sentiments of the church, during the earlier centuries, may be learned from the declaration of Lactantius at the commencement of the fourth century: “The Montanists, Novatians, Valentians—or whatever else they may call themselves, have ceased to be Christians, because they have renounced the *name* of Christians, and called themselves by the names of men.” (Instit. div. l. IV. c. 30). This estimate of the importance of *unity of name*, is doubtless overwrought; yet the influence of different names is far from being unimportant at present. “Names are things” said that distinguished and laborious servant of Christ, the Rev. Dr. A. Green, when on assuming the editorial chair of “The *Presbyterian Magazine*,” he changed its title to *Christian Advocate*. His reasons for this alteration he thus assigns: “We usually form some judgment of a publication from its title; and indeed, it is for this very purpose that a title is given. Now on hearing of a *Presbyterian Magazine*, some, it appears, have set it down at once as a sectarian work, of which the main and ultimate design would be to diffuse and defend the doctrines and opinions which are *peculiar* to the Presbyterians, and on this account they have resolved to give it no encouragement.” What is here acknowledged of the term Presbyterian, is equally true of every other sectarian name of christian churches. Whilst it is conceded that the substitution of geographical for sectarian names could not remove the whole difficulty; it is equally certain that it would *not be without its influence*. Even Celsus, the bitter foe of Christians, when charging on them as criminal their differences on nonessentials which prevailed among them in his day, was compelled to acknowledge as one bond of union among them, their *unity of name*. Thousands of enlightened, true Christians of different denominations differ only in name. And thousands there are among the more ignorant, who exhibit much acerbity against other sects and prepossessions for their own, and yet

are ignorant of all the points of distinction between them except the name.

The *second* bond of union among the primitive churches, was *unity of opinion on all fundamental doctrines, that is, the profession of a creed of fundamentals*. That the primitive Christians, notwithstanding their minor differences, did agree on all fundamental doctrines, is evident, because they possessed either the oral instruction of the apostles, or the same sacred records of them which have produced such unity in fundamentals among modern Christians. It is presupposed by the apostle's injunction "earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints ;" for, before they could contend for the faith, they must have a general understanding among them at least as to what the fundamentals of that faith are, for they were also commanded to abstain from "doubtful disputations," and not "to judge" their brethren for minor differences. It is finally proved by the fact, that they required of every candidate for baptism a profession of his creed of faith prior to the administration of the ordinance : "*If thou believest*" (said Philip to the eunuch) "*with all thine heart, thou mayest be baptized. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*"* The custom of requiring of all applicants for baptism a confession of their faith in the fundamentals of the gospel, seems to have been general throughout the whole church. For among the earliest documents of christian antiquity that have reached us, there is one which by the universal testimony of the christian fathers, is an authentic collection of the several points of doctrine to which this assent was required from the days of the apostles, we mean the so called *Apostles' Creed*. This creed is highly interesting and important, especially to modern Christians ; first, because it shows what the primitive church universally understood the Scriptures to teach ; and secondly, because it incontestibly establishes the fact, that the primitive church, when guided by the inspired apostles, and soon after, *deemed it lawful to require unanimity only in fundamental doctrines* in order to the unity of the church. This creed, let it further be remembered, was the only one which was adopted in the church of Christ until the fourth century, in which the council of Nice adopted one of the same import, and of but little greater length. Some small variations are found in

* Acts 8: 37. See also Rom. 12: 6. 2 Tim. 1: 14. Jude v. 3.

the earliest copies, but substantially it reads thus :* *I believe in God the Father Almighty, the Maker of heaven and earth :*

And in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord ; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried.—The third day he rose from the dead, he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic or universal church ; the communion of saints ; the forgiveness of sins ; the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.

To this, some copies add the sentence “descended into hades, or the place of departed spirits ;” but it was not found in

* The earliest copies of this symbol are in the Latin language. There are several various readings extant, which probably originated in different Western churches, which used this symbol. We shall give the symbol, together with the various readings in parentheses, so that the reader may at one glance see the whole, and also perceive that even with the added variations, it was still a creed which all orthodox Protestants can subscribe :

I. Credo in (unum) Deum, Patrem omnipotentem creatorem coeli et terrae (“*creatorem coeli et terrae*” defuit in orient. et Rom. antiquo symbolo : in Aquilejensi autem positum erat, “*invisibilem et impassibilem.*”)

II. Et in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, (“et in unum Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum, filium ejus unigenitum,” ita addendo et transponendo legit olim Ecclesia orientalis.) Qui conceptus est de Spiritu sancto ; natus ex Maria virgine (“qui natus est de Spiritu sancto ex Maria virgine” communis olim lectio erat.) Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus, descendit ad inferna ; (“crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus” simpliciter olim multi legebant ; Aquilejense tandem symbolum addidit “descendit ad inferna ;” ex quo symbolo Sec. VI. Romana ecclesia hanc appendicem suo symbolo inseruit) tertia die resurrexit a mortuis ; ascendit ad coelos ; sedet ad dextram Dei Patris omnipotentis. Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.

III. Credo in spiritum sanctum (“et in spiritum sanctum” olim), Sanctam (“unam” orientales addiderunt) Ecclesiam Catholicam ; sanctorum communionem, (“catholicam, ex sanctorum communionem” ex Niceno forsitan symbolo insertum, olim defuit), Remissionem peccatorum ; Carnis (*hujus* symb. Aquilej. addidit) resurrectionem ; et vitam aeternam. Amen. (“vitam aeternam” in plerisque olim symbolis desiderabatur). See Clemm's *Einleitung in die Religion und Theologie*, Vol. IV. p. 459.

the creed of the Latin churches, until the sixth century. Here then we have the series of doctrines, the belief of which was the bond of union in the church of Christ during three hundred years ; and was regarded as sufficient for ecclesiastical union, without any inquiry as to differences on minor points. All who adopted these doctrines and adorned them by a consistent walk, were regarded as worthy members of the one, universal church of Christ, were every where admitted to sacramental communion by right. All professing these doctrines, and residing in the same place, were united into one church, and worshipped together ; and different christian churches, occupying the same geographical ground, and distinguished from each other by differences concerning doctrines not contained in this creed, had no existence in the church for several centuries : were totally unknown during the golden age of Christianity. To this summary of doctrine some few articles were added in after ages by different councils, to meet several fundamental heresies which arose. But the additions are few, and generally composed with studious brevity. In reference to these doctrines, which he had just before expressed in his own language, Irenaeus, a strenuous defender of the faith against various heretics, a disciple of Polycarp, the friend of the apostle John, makes the following remarks (*which are equally applicable to the several orthodox Protestant churches though they are so lamentably divided*) : " This faith the church has received, and though dispersed over the whole world, assiduously preserves as if she inhabited a single house ; and believes in these things as having but one heart and one soul : and with perfect harmony proclaims, teaches, hands down these things, as though she had but one mouth. For though there are various and dissimilar languages in the world ; yet the power of the faith transmitted is one and the same. Neither the churches in *Germany*, nor in *Iberia*, (Spain), nor among the *Celtae* (in France), nor in the East, nor in Egypt, nor in Lybia, nor in the middle regions of the world (Jerusalem and the adjacent districts) believe or teach any other doctrines. But as the sun is one and the same throughout the whole ; so the preaching of the truth shines every where, and enlightens all men, who are willing to come to a knowledge of truth. Nor will the most powerful in speech among the governors of the churches say any thing more than these ; (for no one can be above his master) ; nor the most feeble any thing less. For as there is but one faith, he that is

able to speak much cannot enlarge ; nor he who can say little diminish it."*

In the earlier part of the fourth century (A. D. 325) the Nicene Creed was adopted in order to exclude the Arians from the church. It is little else than a repetition of the apostles' creed, with several clauses referring to the error of the Arians. The synod of Constantinople about fifty-six years afterwards (A. D. 381) still further enlarged this summary, by the addition of several clauses concerning the worship of the Holy Spirit, the validity of baptism, etc. This creed as enlarged by the synod of Constantinople, is contained in the symbols of the Lutheran church in Europe, and also in the Prayer Book of our Protestant Episcopal brethren in this country. It reads thus :

"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible.

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds ; God of God, Light of Light, true God of the true God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made ; who for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the virgin Mary, and was made man and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father ; and he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead ; whose kingdom shall have no end.

"And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And I believe in one catholic and apostolic church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins ; and I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come.† "

* Irenaeus adv. haereses, L. I. c. 3. p. 46. ed. Grabe : and Mason's Plea, p. 41.

† The following is the Greek original of the Nicene Creed, as preserved in the History of Socrates, L. I. c. 8. By a comparison of it with the above version, the reader may distinguish the additions made by the council of Constantinople.

Πιστευομεν εις ενα Θεον, πατερα παντοκρατορα, παντων ορατων τε και

These symbols, let it be remembered, we adduce not for the purpose of proving the doctrines contained in them, (a point to be established only by the Scriptures) but in order to establish two facts highly important to our inquiry, viz. 1) that the early Christians did require assent to certain articles of christian faith;) and 2) that these articles to which assent was required, were only fundamental doctrines and facts of the christian religion.

It is thus evident that *unity of opinion on fundamental doctrines and on those alone*, constituted one of the principal bonds of union among churches in the early ages. It is moreover clear, as the several orthodox protestant churches of our land cordially embrace all the doctrines enumerated by Irenaeus and the Apostles' and the Nicene creeds, that they ought not on the principles of primitive Christianity, to be cut up into different sects, but should be united into one universal church. But instead of all the Protestant churches embracing one common creed of fundamentals, and holding it up to the view of the world as the symbol of their unity in the faith as Christians did in the earlier ages at every case of baptism; the use of different creeds naturally inculcates the idea of doctrinal difference in-

αορατων ποιητην. Και εις ενα Κυριον Ιησουν Χριστον, τον υιον του Θεου, γεννηθεντα εκ του Πατρος μονογενη, τουτ' εστιν εκ της ουσιας του Πατρος, Θεον εκ Θεου και φως εκ φωτος, Θεον αληθινον εκ Θεου αληθινου, γεννηθεντα ου ποιηθεντα, ομοουσιον τω πατρι, δι' ου τα παντα εγενετο, τα τε εν τω ουρανω, και τα εν τη γη, δι' ημας ανθρωπους, και δια την ημετεραν σωτηριαν κατελθοντα και σαρκωθεντα και ενανθρωπησαντα παθοντα και ανασταντα τη τριτη ημερα, ανελθοντα εις τους ουρανους, ερχομενον κριναι ζωντας και νεκρους. Και εις το αγιον πνευμα. The above was the original form of the creed, and contains all that catechuimens were required to repeat as their confession. The following clause was however added by the Nicene fathers, and all ministers were required also to subscribe to it: Τους δε λεγοντας οτι ην ποτε οτι ουκ ην, και πρην γεννηθηναι ουκ ην, και οτι εξ ουκ οντων εγενετο, η εξ ετερας υποστασεως η ουσιας φασκοντες ειναι, η κτιστον, η τρεπτον, η αλλοιωτον τον υιον του Θεου, αναθεματιζει η αγια καθολικη και αποστολικη εκκλησια, i. e. The holy, catholic and apostolic church condemns (the opinion of) those who say, that there was a time when the Son of God did not exist, and that before he was begotten he did not exist, and that he was made out of things that were not, or who say that he is of some other hypostasis or substance, or that he was created, or that he is changeable or subject to variation. See Clemm's *Einleitung in Religion und Theologie*, Vol. IV. p. 464-5.

stead of unity ; and their great length, by bringing to light all the minor differences, and ranking them indiscriminately with the fundamentals, and making them the basis of separate churches, inevitably must tend to throw into the shade our real fundamental union and perpetuate the schisms in the body of Christ.

The *third* bond of union among the primitive Christians, *was the mutual acknowledgement of each other's acts of discipline.* If an individual was excommunicated or under censure in one church, he could not obtain admission into any other. As a security against imposition, it was customary for persons in good standing, when travelling into strange places, to take letters of introduction, or certificates of their good standing from the pastor. When any one was destitute of such certificate, his application for church privileges was always rejected. To these letters Paul refers, and expresses the opinion, that he would need no such document among the Corinthians, as he was well known to them : " Need we, as some others, *epistles of commendation* to you, or letters of commendation from you ? Ye are our epistle, written in our hearts, known and read of all men." * This same custom was prescribed in the church for centuries, and numerous synodical decrees were enacted for its confirmation. In the apostolic Canons or Regulations we find the following :

Canon 12. Εἰ τις κληρικὸς ἢ λαϊκὸς ἀφωρισμένος, ἦτοι ἀδεκτός, ἀπελθὼν εἰς ἕτερα πόλει, δεχθῇ ἀνεὺ γραμματῶς συστατικῶν, ἀφορίζεσθω καὶ ὁ δεξαμενὸς καὶ ὁ δεχθεὶς." † That this regulation prevailed from the very days of the apostles, is highly probable, because, as we have seen, Paul himself makes mention of letters of this nature. At the oecumenical or general council held at Nice, in the year A. D. 325, at which were present ministers from the greater part of the christian world, the following resolution, or canon, was adopted :

Resolution or Canon 5. In regard to those persons, whether clergymen or laymen, who have been excommunicated by a bishop, the existing rule is to be retained, namely, that they

* 2 Cor. 3: 1—4.

† *If any excommunicated clergyman, or a layman who has been excommunicated, or denied admission (as member of the church), go to another city and is received without letters of recommendation, both he who receives him, and the person thus received shall be excommunicated.*

*shall not be restored by any other than by the one who excommunicated them. Inquiry ought however to be instituted, whether their expulsion from the church was not occasioned by a contentious spirit or some other mean or hostile passion. And in order that this may be properly done, there shall annually be two synods held in each province, and at these meetings of the bishops, suitable examinations shall be instituted, in order that every person may see the justice of the excommunication of those who transgressed against (the regulations of) the bishop, until the assemblage of bishops shall, if they see fit, pronounce a milder sentence. One of those synodical meetings shall be held before the spring fast, the other in the fall. **

At the council or synod of Antioch, held in A. D. 341, sixteen years after that at Nice, a resolution of just the same import was passed :

Resolution 6. If any person has been excommunicated by his bishop, he shall not be restored by any one else than that bishop himself, unless his case has been examined by the council or synod, and a milder sentence been obtained. This regulation shall be applicable alike to laymen, presbyters, deacons, and all the clergy.†

From these testimonies it is abundantly evident, that the churches in the earlier centuries fully acknowledged the disciplinarian acts of each other : nor is it difficult to perceive the salutary influence which would result from such mutual marks of confidence. Carried to a reasonable extent, they would give an efficacy to church discipline, which it has almost entirely lost in modern times. This regulation would cherish brotherly love between the churches, and tend to give visibility to their union.

The *fourth bond of union among the primitive Christians was sacramental and ministerial communion.* This feature is one of very extensive application and most salutary influence on the different portions of the christian church. The apostle Paul may be regarded as inculcating it in his declaration to the Christians at Corinth ; “ *For we being many, are one bread and one body* (that is, you at Corinth, I and my fellow-Christians here at Ephesus, from the midst of whom I am addressing you, are

* Fuch's Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen, Vol. I. p. 394.

† Ibid. Vol. II. p. 62.

one body); *for we are all partakers of that one bread.*"* Accordingly we find, that in the earliest period to which the records of christian antiquity extend, every church received to communion as fully as its own members, the members and ministers of every other acknowledged christian church on earth, upon evidence of their good standing. Strangers coming from other churches were required to present letters or certificates of their standing; and all Christians, whether clergy or laymen, regarded it as a duty to commune with the members of any other church, at which they happened to be present. It was a common custom for Christians in the earlier centuries, when travelling, to take such certificates of membership with them; and when stopping in a city or town, they sought out the Christians living in it, and received from them every mark of attention and friendship. These letters were termed *literae formatae* or *γραμματα τετυπωμενα*, as they were of a particular form to prevent counterfeits; they were sometimes denominated *epistolae communicatoriae*, or *γραμματα κοινωνικα*, letters of ecclesiastical communion or fellowship.†

The broad principle of scriptural *christian communion* extends indiscriminately to all whom we regard as true disciples of Christ. Thus it is laid down by Peter in his vindication, when censured for communing with Gentile converts: "thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them."‡ His argument is thus summed up, after he had detailed the facts on which it rested; "*Forasmuch as God gave them the like gift, as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?*"

It is equally certain that *ministerial communion* and official acknowledgement pervaded the church in her primitive ages. The regulations made by different synods or councils to prevent the abuse of this privilege incontestibly establish its existence. But even in the apostolic canons we find the following:

Canon 32. Μηδενα των ξενων επισκοπων η πρεσβυτερων η διακονων ανευ συστατικων προσδεχασθαι· και επιφερομενων αυτων ανακρινεσθωσαν· και ημεν ωσι κηρυκες της ευσεβειας προσδεχασθωσαν· ει δε μηγε, την χρειαν αυτοις επιχορηγησαντες,

* 1 Cor. 10: 17.

† Neander's Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Religion und Kirche, Vol. I. p. 320.

‡ Acts 12: 3, 17.

εἰς κοινωνίαν αὐτοὺς μὴ προσδεξεσθε· πολλὰ γὰρ κατὰ συναρ-
παγὴν γίνεται.*

At the synod of Carthage, held A. D. 348 or 349, it was resolved that "*no one shall receive a minister without letters from his bishop.*"†

If furnished with suitable testimonials a minister in one part of the church was acknowledged as such in every other, and if present at public worship was ordinarily invited to take part in conducting the services.

The tendency which such *free sacramental intercommunion* as opportunity offers with all over the whole earth who present credible evidence of genuine discipleship, cannot readily be calculated. The views and principles and feelings which it presupposes, constitute important elements of the millennial union of the future church. God grant their speedy dissemination over the church universal!

The *fifth* means by which unity was promoted and preserved among the primitive Christians, was *occasional epistolary communication*. Of this fact we have abundant proof in the epistles of Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius and Barnabas, who are termed apostolic fathers, because they lived partly in the apostolic age. Some of these epistles are doubtless spurious and all corrupted, yet enough remains to answer the purpose for which we adduce them to show that they were letters written to different churches to promote doctrinal and ecclesiastical union among them. The age immediately subsequent to the apostles furnishes numerous instances of such epistolary communion of the churches. From Eusebius we learn that Dionysius of Corinth about the year A. D. 160, sent abroad numerous epistles of this kind. "And first (says Eusebius*) we must speak

* "Let no one receive strange (foreign) bishops or presbyters or deacons without letters of recommendation; and the letters that are brought must be examined. If they prove to be pious preachers (preachers of piety) let them be received: but if they do not; their immediate necessities should be supplied, but they must not be received into communion. For many instances of fraud have occurred in this matter." Koepler's Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Vol. IV. p. 240.

† Fuch's Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen, Vol. III. p. 35.

* Eusebius, IV. ch. 23. Καὶ πρῶτον γε περὶ Διονυσίου πατρὸς· ὅτι τῆς ἐν Κορίνθῳ παροιίας τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγκρατεῖστο θρόνον, καὶ ὡς τῆς ἐνθίου φιλοπονίας οὐ μόνον τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ τοῖς

of Dionysius, who was appointed over the church at Corinth, and imparted freely not only to his own people, but to others abroad also, the blessings of his divine labors. But he was most useful to all in the general epistles which he addressed to the churches. One of them is addressed to the Lacedaemonians, and contains *instructions in the true religion, and inculcates peace and unity*: one also to the Athenians, exciting them to the faith and the life prescribed by the gospel, from which he shows that they had swerved, so that they had nearly fallen from the truth since the martyrdom of Publius, their leader (bishop) which happened in the persecutions of those times. The necessity of such letters as means of christian instruction, is at present superseded by the universal dissemination of the holy Scriptures; yet as bonds of christian union, they may still be occasionally resorted to with the happiest results, especially between Christians of distant countries as a substitute for personal intercourse. We cannot but commend the epistle of the venerable Dr. Planck of Germany, to the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in this country, as also the epistles of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches of the United States to the Christians of the same denomination in Europe. Still, all these epistles bear on their front the badge of schism; for they were addressed by particular sects of Christians, not to Christians of another country generally, but only to Christians of the same sect. They are epistles from followers of Paul and Apollos in one land, to disciples of the same leaders in another. So completely has sectarianism separated the several denominations, that by many it is regarded as immodest to address any others than those of our own sect. Instead of that community of interest between all the members of Christ's body, which the apostle inculcates, "so that all the members should have the same care one for another, and whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it;"* sectarianism has taught each

ἐν τῇς ἀλλοδαπῇς ἀφθόνως ἐκοινώνει· χρησίμωτατον ἅπασιν δαυτὸν καθίστας, ἐν αἷς ὑπεινποῦτο καθολικαῖς πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιστολαῖς· ὡς ἐστίν, ἡ μὲν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους, ὀρθοδοξίας κατηχήτικη, εἰρήνης τε καὶ ἐνωσίας ὑποθετική· ἡ δὲ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, διεγερτικὴ πιστέως καὶ τῇς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πολιτείας· ἥς ὀλιγορησάντας ἐλεγχεῖ, ὥς ἂν μικροῦ διῶν ἀποστάντας τοῦ λόγου, ἐξ οὐπὲρ τὸν προειστώτα αὐτῶν Πούπλιον μαρτυρῆσαι κατὰ τοὺς τότε συνειβῇ διωγμούς.

* 1 Cor. 12: 26.

member of the body to stand aloof from the others, has taught them by no means to "have the same care one for another!!"

The *last* bond of primitive union was the *occasional consultation* of different churches by representatives *convened in a council or synod*. This means of prolonging unity among Christians was for several reasons not very frequently resorted to in the apostolic age. The continual journies of the apostles tended in a measure to answer the same purpose. How often councils for mutual consultation were held, prior to that at Rome, mentioned by Eusebius, we know not; but the principle being sanctioned by the apostolic example, Acts xv., the church should apply it just as extensively as is found to promote the spirit of union, brotherly love and order among Christians. As however *neither Christ nor his apostles have appointed such bodies as courts of judicature or appeal*; it is probable, that whatever business of this kind is referred to the more extensive judicatories, their decisions should be regarded mainly as advisory, and should have no other force than results from the evidence alleged in support of the opinion given. The danger of such General Synods, Assemblies, or Conventions, arises not so much from the number of churches represented in them, as from the great *number* of the delegates, from the degree of *power* conferred on them by the elementary members of Christ's body, the individual churches; and from the amount of *actual business* which is *transferred from the churches in their elementary capacity, to these judicatories*. If the delegation be small, so that the whole body will not be unwieldly; if the business transacted be not such as properly belongs to the individual churches; if it relate only to the general interests of the church; and if the powers of the body be only advisory; this principle of mutual consultation might to a certain extent be safely employed.

In view of these facts and principles, the writer regarded with high approbation the proposition for a re-organization of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church by making it an Advisory Council. That measure, which was proposed in the Biblical Repertory of 1832, was by uncontradicted fame attributed to the Rev. Dr. Alexander, and contains a distinguished specimen of practical wisdom, and enlarged views of the principles of our holy religion, in their application to ecclesiastical jurisprudence. On precisely the same general principles, the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in this country was

founded seventeen years ago, and of its salutary and safe practical operation, scarcely a dissenting voice is heard among the enlightened friends of evangelical piety among us.

We have thus endeavored faithfully to exhibit the features which constituted the unity of the primitive church. Let us now pursue the subject further, deduce the principles furnished by these facts, and finally develope a plan to restore the unity of the body of Christ on the same apostolic principles, which constituted it in the primitive ages; a consummation which ought to be devoutly wished for by every disciple of that Saviour who so earnestly prayed for the union of his followers; an object so dear to the heart of the noble-minded Calvin, that to accomplish it he says: "*As to myself, were I likely to be of any service, I would not hesitate, were it necessary, for such a purpose, to cross ten seas*" (*Quantum ad me attinet, siquis mei usus fore videbitur, ne decem quidem maria, si opus sit, ob eam rem trajicere pigeat.* Calvin's Epist. p. 61).

ARTICLE VII.

THE HEBREW TENSES.

Translation of Ewald's Syntax, in the second (abridged) edition of his Hebrew Grammar, so far as it respects the use of the Tenses in Hebrew, with remarks on the same, by M. Stuart, of the Theol. Seminary, Andover.

[THE apparently unlimited metes and bounds of the Hebrew tenses, as employed in the Old Testament Scriptures, have given rise to many curious, and to some not uninteresting theories, in relation to this subject. Long has this usage been the stumbling-block of grammarians, and particularly of those who were inclined to maintain, that every thing in language is managed with the most perfect regularity and uniformity. That the Future tense in Hebrew should ever be employed as the common historic Aorist in narrations of events that occurred in past time, while the Praeterite has far more than an equal share in designating things yet to come, is a phenomenon which at least is singular in many respects, and which would (as it has actually done) naturally give rise to many and diverse theories and conjectures.

It is not my present purpose to enter into the history or the examination of these at large. It would require somewhat of a volume for either ; and my apprehension is, that such a volume would not find a very numerous class of readers ; certainly not in our country. Most of the theories which have been broached, have indeed been ephemeral. They have appeared and disappeared with the authors of their existence. And one good reason for this has been, that most of the authors of such theories have been men of very limited acquisitions in the Hebrew language, and therefore could not have much weight in the scale of Hebrew literature, nor extend their influence very far.

At present, however, we find the matter in circumstances which are quite different. Ewald is unquestionably among the first Hebrew scholars now upon the stage of action. He has great talents for linguistic acquisition ; nor is he by any means wanting in the power of philosophical speculation on the nature and attributes of language. That he is free from all embarrassments on the ground of *precedents*, is sufficiently manifest, in every step of his progress, to please the most independent class of critics, who hold least of all to *authority* in these matters. In my own view, this independency is excessive in Ewald. It seems to me to have become even a morbid feeling, and to have urged him on to make the differences between himself and other grammarians as numerous and as large as possible.

On no subject, perhaps, has he gained more reputation for himself, than in the department of Hebrew Syntax. It has become fashionable among one class of Hebrew critics in Germany, to appeal almost exclusively to Ewald as authority ; and seldom do they mention other grammarians, unless it be in the way of a sneer, or in order to show some kind of contempt for them. One would think, from the tenor of what is said by them in relation to this subject, that all other Hebrew philologists now on the stage had already outlived their fame and their usefulness.

Having recently been engaged in publishing a new edition of my Hebrew Grammar, I went through a review of the Syntax in as thorough a manner as the haste with which it was printed permitted me to do. One duty which I prescribed to myself was, to read and compare Ewald's Syntax ; specially that of the abridged edition of his Grammar, which contains a more orderly digest than the first edition, and thoughts more matured. In making this comparison I was much struck with that part of

his Syntax which has respect to the use of the Hebrew tenses. When I had completed my grammatical labour, and finished the printing of my book, I felt a strong desire to re-examine (more at leisure) the theory of Ewald on the subject of the Hebrew tenses. This I have done, and the following translation, with the remarks which are appended, is the result of my re-examination. I give them to the public, because the subject is one of deep interest to every student of Hebrew grammar, and of much importance, to say the least, to Hebrew philology and criticism.

In introducing Prof. Ewald to speak for himself, I hope that I shall avoid the imputation of having misconstrued or misrepresented him. At least this cannot be charged upon me, unless I have purposely mistranslated him. This I have not done; but I cannot assure the reader, that I have always translated him with correctness. I can truly say, that I have done my best to accomplish this; but, I must add, that after being for a quarter of a century somewhat acquainted with the German language, and after having read more in it, during that period of time, than I have in my mother-tongue, I am still unable in some cases to find out the meaning of Prof. Ewald to my satisfaction. I can only say, now and then, as Castalio says in his apologetic note for a version of a passage more literal than he was accustomed to make: "This I have translated literally, because I do not understand it." Perhaps as to one or two passages in Ewald, some one who can better strip off the *Umhüllung* which this celebrated writer throws over all his speculations than I can do, might feel disposed to question, whether I had gone so far as to give even a literal version. Be it so then; 'Si quis prospiciat — vaticinetur.' He shall do so at least with my liberty, and I will make—not my *palinode*, for that would imply that I had consciously done wrong, or, at least through negligence—but, my acknowledgements that there are *depths* in Ewald, down into which I have not had address or skill or strength enough to plunge.

But some things which I think I do understand, I have called in question. Ewald's views and mine, therefore, are both before the reader; and he has the opportunity of judging for himself. This is all that justice and candour can demand; and in the doing of this, I am satisfied that I have done my duty fairly.
—M. S.]

SYNTAX OF THE VERB, by Prof. Ewald.

§ 470. Five forms of the Hebrew verb serve to designate time or tense; viz. the *two Modes* [Praeter and Future tense],* which at the same time also mark the distinction of Mode; the same two Modes with *Vav relative* or *conversive* prefixed; and the *Participle*. The Hebrew employs these forms, not according to the method of distinguishing tenses in our languages, (to the spirit of which it is quite foreign), but still with a distinction so definite that they cannot be exchanged for each other, while they plainly mark the principal difference of the tenses.

[A]

§ 471. THE TWO MODES [Praeter and Future], considered merely in respect to their use as tenses, represent all action *aoristically*, i. e. without reference to any other action or time. They differ from each other in such a way, that the first Mode marks that which is *completed, definite, and certain*; the second Mode that which is *not completed, indefinite, and dependent on circumstances*. Consequently they do not in themselves mark a time which is definite, but are capable of being applied to any portion of time, provided that the leading idea designated by them be retained.

§ 472. Hence the FIRST MODE [Praeter] is employed, (1) To designate the *past*, when an action that has once taken place is simply presented, without any reference to any thing else; e. g. 'God בָּרָא, *created* the world;' מָה עָשִׂיתָ, *what hast thou done?*

(2) To designate the *present*; (a) When any particular action which has once taken place, may be again repeated; e. g. רָשָׁע נִאָץ יְהוָה, *the wicked man despises Jehovah*, Ps. 10: 3. (b) When a state or condition began in some undefined past time, and one still sees the completion of it, [i. e. one sees that the same state or condition is still continued]; e. g. יָדַעְתִּי, *I know*; זָכַרְתִּי, *I remember*, Num. 11: 5; אָהֵב, *he loves*; שָׂנֵא, *he hates*; נִמָּאץ, *he refuses*, Ex. 10: 3; מִאָס, *he despises*. Of course such a meaning [i. e. that of the present tense] is frequent in [the first mode of] intransitive Verbs. Different from

* The passages included in brackets, I have added for the sake of explanation. M. S.

this are various methods of designating the Present, as described in § 473, 2. § 483.

(3) To designate the *future*. This can happen, only when the thing to be done is, in the mind of the speaker, already regarded as being *virtually completed*, and consequently as *unconditional* and *certain*, (as in German the Present is often put for the Future); e. g. frequently in the declarations of the Divine Being, as נִתְּנָהּ, *I will constitute*, Gen. 17: 20. In the poets and prophets is the same usage, even in other parts of discourse, although this is not frequent; e. g. אֲבָדוּ, *they shall perish*, Ps. 10: 16. Mic. 1: 11.

§ 473. THE SECOND MODE [Future] has a very extensive use.

(1) In accordance with the idea it designates of a thing *not yet accomplished and indefinite*, it is employed, (a) To express a thing simply FUTURE; e. g. יִהְיֶה, *he will be*. (b) To designate a *future* in time which is already past, when the context has reference in general to a time past; in which case the idea of that which is past lies merely in the connection; e. g. the first born אֲשֶׁר יִמְלֹךְ, *who should reign* [qui regnaturus erat] *in his stead*. (c) For the *Futurum praeteritum* in dependent clauses; e. g. הֲיָדָע בִּי יֵאמָר, *could we have known that he would say?* (Like יָדַעְתִּי בִּי יֵאמָר, *I knew that he would say*), Gen. 43: 7, 25.

(2) Out of the idea of that which is incomplete flows the idea of *becoming*, of *origination*, of *taking rise*. Hence, (a) The second Mode designates an action not yet completed, but which is being completed or finished; (we designate this by the *Present*). E. g. 'Why are ye coming out,' הֲצֵאתִי, 1 Sam. 17: 8. In this sense the second Mode comes near to occupying the same ground with the first, which sometimes designates the *Present*. There is still, however, this distinction, that the first Mode speaks of a thing as already completed, and the second of that which is becoming completed; e. g. מֵאֵינָן בָּאתָ, *whence art thou come?* [as having already arrived]; and מֵאֵינָן תָּבֹא, *whence dost thou come?* [the action not being yet complete]. It should be noted, however, that the *first* Mode is not often employed in this way.

(b) The second Mode also designates an *origination* or *becoming* so and so in time past, [i. e. a thing once present and becoming completed in time that is past]. The poets use this form frequently, (1) In order to transfer an action to the time

of its rise or origination, when it was present ; (like the Latin Imperfect) ; as *אָז הָיָה לָךְ*, *then thou wast born*, Job 38: 21. See also Job 3: 3, 11. 15: 7. (2) When in vivid narration they transfer past things to the present ; as *יִנְחֵנִי*, *he conducts me*, Num. 23: 7. In prose the first of these two usages sometimes may be found ; as *גִּידָנוּ*, *we were knowing*, Gen. 43: 7. Often, moreover, the second Mode stands connected in such cases with *אָז then* ; as *אָז יָשָׁר*, *then sang he*, Ex. 15: 1. Jos. 8: 30.

(c) In particular, the idea of *an action often repeated or continued*, flows out of the preceding view of the second Mode ; for every action of this kind can be regarded as still continuing and yet to be renewed. So for the *Present*, *יֹאמַר*, *dicitur, dicunt* ; specially in comparisons, as *בְּאֶחָד יֵשֶׁה*, *as one is wont to uphold*, Deut. 1: 31. So also for the *Past*, the idea of which flows merely out of the connection of the views of the speaker ; as *יַעֲשֶׂה שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה*, *he was wont to do yearly*, 1 Sam. 1: 7. 2: 19.

(3) From the meaning comprised in the *second Mode* arises further the idea of *that which is indefinite, or dependent on circumstances or feelings* ; so that it answers to express the *Subjunctive* ; e. g. *כִּדְּאֶקֶב*, *how can I curse ?* Num. 23: 8. Even the *Subjunctive past* is expressed by it ; as *וְאֶשְׁלַחְךָ*, *that I might have sent thee away*, Gen. 31: 27.

This mode is also employed in quoting the thoughts of another, and stands, (a) In indirect quotation ; as *אָמַר כִּי יָשׁוּבוּן*, *he commands that they shall return*, Job 36: 10. So *יַעֲמִדוּ . . . וְיִמְּנוּ*, *and he gave order . . . that they should stand*, Dan. 1: 5. This method of speaking, however, is not frequent, as the general spirit of simple syntax would naturally lead us to suppose. (b) The second Mode is employed in uttering direct commands or unconditional wishes ; e. g. *חֲמַל*, *thou shalt eat*, Gen. 2: 16. *לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה*, *which should not be done*, Gen. 20: 9. 34: 7. Lev. 7: 2. So respecting the *Past* ; as *אָנֹכִי*, *I would have died*, Job 3: 11. 8: 16. 10: 18, 19.

(4) More expressly still to designate this idea of *command and wish*, an abridged form of the second Mode arose, viz. the *Jussive* and *Imperative* ; and still more expressly to render the wish or command emphatic, the paragogic *וְ* is appended to the Imperative. See § 240—243.

§ 474. According to these leading distinctions of meaning are the two Modes employed in a variety of ways with *particles* ; of these I shall treat particularly in the sequel.

[B]

Of the two modes with VAV RELATIVE or CONVERSIVE, the two relative historic forms.

§ 475. From the simple copulative ו (and) we must carefully separate the more expressive particle which connects sentences, and which at the same time includes in itself the idea of *time* or a *sequency of ideas*; and answers, therefore, to the German *und dann, und so, dann, so, so dass, [and then, and so, then, so, so that]*. The idea of *advance in respect to time* is transferred to a *sequency of thought*. This Vav stands only in the beginning of a sentence, which holds such a relation to a preceding one; as that in the junction of them a *sequency of time or of thought is expressed*. Thence the Vav inserted here may most appropriately be named *Vav relative*. This more significant Vav is also designated by a different mode of pronouncing it. In the full form in which it is commonly associated with the second Mode, it sounds וַ (vǎy) and [frequently] it alters the tone [or place of accent]. Before the first Mode, (and elsewhere, § 591), it is sounded as is the simple copula (ו), but it also [oftentimes] changes the tone, when placed before the first Mode, § 245. Thence both the Vav relative and the Mode of the verb are so inseparably connected, that they cannot be dissevered without entirely losing their force; and so too that the more intimate connection, such as וַיָּבֹא *and he comes*, is directly the opposite of the looser connection, וַיָּבֹא . . . וַיָּבֹא *and he came*, § 478.

Vav relative with the second Mode.

§ 476. (1) When Vav relative is placed before the second Mode, it involves in this continually the idea of *becoming*, of *taking rise*, or *originating*; this union [of וַ with the Future] represents the sequency of the new becoming [of a thing, or] originating of an action out of something which precedes. Consequently, (a) Since this Vav marks *sequency of time*, it is most frequently employed to designate *an action once done*, but so that the first Mode stands as a correlative with it in a simple *aoristic* sense, e. g. וַיֹּאמֶר וַיְהִי, *he spake and then it was*, or *and so it was, it began to be, it became*; וַיֵּרָא וַיִּתְּשַׁח, *thou sawest and then thou didst rejoice*, or *and so thou didst rejoice*. And in this way is Vav relative constantly employed in the narration

of things that have already taken place, inasmuch as it continues the new development and unfolding of the several successions of events according to their natural sequences; and this Vav relative is constantly continued, except where difficulties (§ 478) are interposed.

More unfrequently, and almost within the same limits as the first Mode, when used as an Aorist (§ 472), can this form be employed to designate the *Present* and the *Future*; e. g. Gen. 19: 9. Nah. 1: 4. Amos 9: 6. Mic. 2: 13. But this is made clear merely by the connection of the discourse. Possibly a second Mode may in this way precede an Aorist.

(2) The same period of time [*the past*] can the second Mode designate, when it is employed to mark *the sequency of thought*; e. g. in making deductions or conclusions from that which precedes, as וַיִּקֶּם, *and so it continued*, Gen. 23: 30. When this Mode is employed (as it is), in completing what is necessary after a protasis of a sentence, ו then corresponds well to *so, so that*; e. g. 'What is man וַיִּתְּנָהּ, *that thou takest cognizance of him!*' Ps. 144: 3. Is. 51: 12, 13. 1 Sam. 15: 23. It is also employed, when (after one or more words inserted which break in upon the tenor of the discourse) the writer returns again and resumes that tenor; e. g. 'and as to his concubine (and her name was Rumah,) וַיִּלְדָּהּ גַּם הִיא, *even she also bore children,*' Gen. 22: 24.

§ 477. This second species of Vav relative, also, as well as the first, must be preceded by some sentence or proposition, to which the sequency or succession of time has a relation or reference. No book, nor discourse, nor separate narration, can begin with such a second Mode. (Respecting וַיִּהְיֶה see § 479). The form, however, [of that which precedes] is altogether a matter of indifference, if there only remains the idea of a *Vav relative*; for any kind of verbal form may precede this, or a sentiment without a verb, or an abrupt clause. A verb or a sentence may also precede this Vav relative which marks *sequency of time*, whose own appropriate time is quite different; e. g. 'This man *has come here* as a stranger, וַיָּבֹא, *and now he will be acting the part of a judge,*' Gen. 19: 9. 2 Sam. 3: 8. With particular frequency is this second Mode with Vav employed in the sense of No. 1 above, after words expressing limitation of time, and when this limitation (which forms a kind of abrupt clause thrown in) precedes the verb with ו; e. g. בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי וַיִּשָּׂא, *on the third day then lifted he up*, Gen. 22: 4.

§ 478. The reasons which may prevent the employment of Vav relative [with the second Mode] in continued discourse, may be partly in the *meaning*, and partly in the *form* of the discourse. Is an Aorist to be employed, then the *first Mode*, according to common custom, is to be used in describing an action absolutely and simply past. Vav relative with the second Mode is therefore superseded, on account of the *meaning*,

(1) When propositions are introduced which involve no *sequency* of time or of meaning—when there is a *stand-still* in the narration. For example, (a) When the foregoing verb is simply explained by a new one, without any intervening particle, so that the same action is a second time virtually described; as וַיֵּצְאוּ . . . הָלְכוּ, *then went they straight onwards—they travelled*, 1 Sam. 6: 12. Gen. 21: 14. [Here the second verb is *Praeter*, therefore, instead of Future]. (b) When an explanatory clause is thrown in (with the verb following its subject) by an insertion before it of ו simply copulative, in which case the participle may be employed to mark continued action (§ 484) and the first Mode [*Praeter*] to designate momentary actions; e. g. וַיֹּאמֶר וַיִּשְׁאוֹל הָיָה, *then he said—and Saul thought*, i. e. Saul said and thought). Seldom is the first Mode employed immediately after the copula ו [in such cases], in a mere additional explanation of a preceding clause, without any advance in the time or in the narration, as in Gen. 21: 25. 28: 6; in mere synonymes, however, this is frequent. (c) When any inserted clause interrupting the main discourse is thrown in, which begins with another particle, viz. אֲשֶׁר, כִּי, etc.; by reason of which a sentence in reality new commences, so far as *sequency of time* is concerned, and in which Vav relative with the second Mode can no more stand, than in the beginning of a discourse, chapter, etc. (§ 477); e. g. וַיִּירָאוּ כִּי אָמְרוּ, *then feared they, for they said*, etc., 1 Sam. 4: 7. The momentary actions which the first Mode designates, while standing in subordinate clauses with ו or other particles, commonly are such as relate to an earlier period than that in the main narrative (the *Pluperfect*); which, however, is disclosed only by the nature of the case and the comparison of actions, etc. The language has no appropriate form for the *Pluperfect*, and employs the first Mode to designate it, as the Greeks do the Aorists; e. g. 'They buried Absalom, וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת אֲבִישׁוֹן, *now Absalom had taken*, etc., 2 Sam. 18: 18; 'The place אֲשֶׁר עָמַד, *where he had stood*, Gen. 19: 27.

(2) Vav relative with the second Mode cannot be employed by reason of the *form*, when a word must stand before the verb. The proper meaning of this form [Vav relative with 2nd Mode] can be designated only when the connection is appropriate ; so that the verb cannot be in this Mode unless it stands with a ו in its full significance at the beginning of a clause. If a word necessarily stands before such a verb with ו, then this ו becomes a simple Vav *copulative*, and the Future becomes a simple Aorist, as in the beginning of a discourse, without any intimate connection with the preceding clause.

(3) The second Mode with Vav relative cannot stand before a clause, (a) Which begins with לֹא, inasmuch as this must always precede the verb ; e. g. וַיֹּאמֶר וְלֹא אָבָה, *then he commanded, but he would not.* (b) When one or more words, on account of their importance or in the way of antithesis are set before the verb, it takes the first Mode : as ' then *called he* the dry land earth, but the collection of the waters *he called seas*, וַיִּקְרָא יַב־שָׁמַיִם וַיִּקְרָא אֶרֶץ, Gen. 1: 10.

§ 479. When one or more words, which of themselves make a short sentence or even one of considerable extent, are inserted before a verb which in itself might be joined with Vav relative after a train of thought, it frequently happens, that instead of the mere copula ו [which in such a case might be expected according to the principles above developed], the formula וַיְהִי, *and then it was or happened*, is employed [before such inserted words] ; and thus the force of the relation is preserved in such a way, that after this either Vav relative may follow, when some consequence is deduced in the next clause out of the previously inserted clause, or (with less strict limitation) the Aorist. This last is more usually made by the Praeter with Vav prefixed, § 481.

The formula וַיְהִי is made use of most commonly, (1) Before some limitation of time expressed or implied. (a) Before some definite expression of a limitation ; as וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי כֵן, *and it came to pass after such things.* (b) Before an implied limitation ; as וַיְהִי כְּבֹאֹ, *and it came to pass as he was coming*, Judg. 3: 26 ; וַיְהִי הוּא מִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה, *and it came to pass while he was bowing himself*, Is. 37: 38.

(2) Less frequent is the use of וַיְהִי before other kinds of words, particularly when they do not intimate any thing but an obscure or very distant limitation of time ; as וַיְהִי הַיּוֹשָׁבִים, *and it came to pass—the remnant—they even dispersed*,

1 Sam. 11: 11. 10: 11. Is. 22: 7. Only the late Hebrew writers put **וַיְהִי** at the beginning of a book.

Vav relative with the first Mode.

§ 480. The first mode [Praeter] with Vav relative is employed when the idea is designated of an action which is certain, and (if it is still to be done) so good as already completed, (§ 472). In this capacity it may answer to our *Present*. It is so employed, that the second Mode (used as an Aorist) must precede it, or at least must be implied in case the idea of relation falls away [?]; so that, since Vav relative of the second Mode [Future] is usually employed as a correlative to the first Mode, there arises, by such a usage, the most complete distinction of both Aorists and relative forms of tense. Hence this Vav relative of the first Mode is found exactly in all cases where the second Mode as Aorist is employed, § 473.* Consequently,

(1) In a description of the *future*; where it is the more *definite* form, when compared with the Vav relative and second Mode; as **וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיִּלָּחֶם**, *he will go and then fight*. It is not necessary, however, [to the employment of the first Mode with **ו** relative], that the *future* should be spoken of in the preceding clause, or that the second Mode should stand in it. Any form of the verb may precede, or a clause without a verb, and a conclusion may be drawn relative to the *future* from the *present*; as 'There is no fear of God here, **וְהָרַגוּ**, and so (i. e. since this is so) *they will kill me*,' Gen. 20: 11. So, too, a conclusion from the *past* may be drawn; e. g. 'This *kath* touched thy lips, and so thy sin will depart,' **וְנָסַר** . . . **וְנָסַר**, Is. 6: 7.

(2) Vav relative with the first Mode is employed for the *Present*, and is particularly frequent in respect to actions repeated or continuing; as 'he *flees* before the lion and *falls* upon the bear,' **וְנָסַר** . . . **וְנָסַר**, Amos 5: 19. Nah. 3: 12. Job 7: 4 (where the proper alteration of tone is wanting). Hence this form is frequent in describing actions of the *past*, which are continued or often repeated. Indeed this is one of the principal uses of this form, and separates it sufficiently from the second Mode as described in § 476; e. g. 'A mist **וְהַשְׁקָה** **וְהַשְׁקָה**

* I have translated this as literally as I could; I do not profess to understand it. M. S.

ascended (was continually going up) and *then it watered the earth*.*

Every form of the verb may also precede this use of the first Mode; so that not only the second Mode, but the participle when it marks a state or condition during which something else was done or was in a particular state (§ 484), and then this, with the particular things involved in it, is further described; as in Gen. 2: 10. 37: 7. Jos. 6: 13. Is. 6: 2, 3. 1 Sam. 17: 20. So too the second Mode with Vav relative may precede, inasmuch as the description of things past often includes the idea of things frequently repeated, or in some particular cases even renders prominent the idea of repetition; as in 1 Sam. 1: 3. 7: 15. 16: 23. Gen. 30: 41, 42. 38: 9. The later writers, however, began to commingle this form with the second Mode, when the discourse related to the past; see Gen. 37: 7. Ruth 4: 7. Job 1: 4, 5.†

(3) This relative first Mode follows the second Mode when it stands in the sense of the *Conjunctive*, and thus employed it describes merely the necessary and certain consequences of the first action; as *מִן־יָבֹא וְחָבְנִי*, *that he may not come and then smite me*, Gen. 32: 12. Consequently this form may be employed,

(4) After the Imperative and Jussive, when the force of the command ceases, and the subsequent description merely relates what followed as a consequence; as *מִנִּיג בּוֹ וְקָבְרָתוֹ*, *smite him, and then do thou bury him*; *דַּבֵּר וְאָמַרְתָּ*, *speak, so that thou shalt say*, 1 K. 2: 31. Lev. 1: 2. Gen. 41: 34—36. But if the force of the command or wish still continues, the Jussive or Imperative form is also continued, and this either with or without *וְ*.

§ 481. Finally the first relative Mode is altogether like the second Mode, in several respects as it regards external significance or position.

(1) It cannot stand in the beginning of a sentence or clause; but still it is indifferent what the form of the preceding verb or clause may be (comp. § 477). An unfinished clause may precede, from which a deduction is made by the verb in the rela-

* But here the Future indicates action just as often repeated as the other marked by the Praeter. The example proves quite too much for the author. M. S.

† [Genesis then is a *late* writing!]

tive first Mode ; as *לְמַעַן שְׁמֶךָ וְסִלַּחְתָּ*, *because of thy name*, i. e. because thy name is so great, *so wilt thou forgive*, Ps. 25: 11. A clause designating time may also precede ; as *עֶרֶב וַיֵּדְעוּם*, *at evening* (when it is evening) *then shall ye know*, Ex. 16: 6, 7. 17: 4. Gen. 3: 5.

(2) The Aorist is managed here, on account of either meaning or form altogether in a manner like that of the relative second Mode (§ 478) ; and since this relative first mode, employed as an Aorist, is a correlative of the second Mode, so this latter is regularly and for the sake of complete correspondence always employed after it [the first Mode] as an Aorist. In the beginning of a sentence the first Mode relative sometimes stands to designate the Future, § 472 ; but when this is so done, the second Mode as *Aorist* of course follows ; e. g. Gen. 17: 12. Deut. 15: 6. Only the poets (according to § 492) employ the first Mode for the *future*, and this but seldom ; as in Job 5: 20. Is. 11: 8. If however the discourse turns upon a thing, which, in comparison with other future things may be regarded as *past*, then the first relative Mode may be employed.

(3) In cases where *וַיָּהִי* may be employed, (see § 479), *וְהָיָה* may also be employed ; e. g. before limitations of time, as *וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא*, *and it will come to pass at that time*. So before particles serving to mark designations of time ; as *וְהָיָה אִם*, *and it shall come to pass if*— Or if the discourse has respect to the *past*, then render, *so oft as* ; Num. 21: 9. Gen. 38: 9. And so, also, before any words which indicate limitations of time ; e. g. Gen. 4: 14, *and it shall be (וְהָיָה) that every one who findeth me*, etc., = whenever one finds me, Ex. 18: 22. In other cases likewise ; e. g. Hos. 2: 1. Deut. 7: 12. Is. 3: 24. 7: 22.

[C]

Participle or relative Tense.

§ 482. Since the Participle has its *origin* in the verb, but its *form* and *immediate signification* from the adjective, so it is distinguished, when employed as a predicate with the significance and construction of a verb, from the Modes [Praeter and Future], inasmuch as it presents an action rather as *continuing*, *established*, *enduring*, while the Modes designate merely the practising or development of an action. Hence the *Participle* is the tense of *enduring condition* or *state* ; which is explicable

on the ground of its reference to another time present in thought or words ; it is the *relative Tense*. It is accordingly employed,

§ 483. (1) Only in sentences, when the condition is evident from circumstances to the hearer ; viz. (a) For the *Present relative*, in respect to an action still continuing ; as אֲנִי הֹלֵךְ, *I [am] going*, or *I go* at the present moment, Judg. 17: 9. Often is הֹלֵךְ prefixed, in order to indicate the *continuing state* ; as הִנֵּה אָחִיךָ מְתַנָּחֵם, *behold ! thy brother is angry*, Gen. 27: 42. The Participle is distinguished, when used for the Present, from the second Mode employed in the like way (§ 473), inasmuch as the first indicates simply the continuance of a thing, action, etc., while the second indicates the renewal or repetition of it, or the continually originating state.*

(b) For the *Future relative*, in respect to an action which one has already determined to do, and so that the future is indicated in this way as speedily to follow the present moment ; e. g. אֲנַחְנוּ מְשַׁחֲרִימִים, *we are about to destroy*, Gen. 19: 13, 14. Often here, also, with הֹלֵךְ preceding.

(c) For the *Praeter relative* ; which, however, must be evident to the hearer from other description of the past ; and therefore rarely used in this sense when placed alone, e. g. Gen. 41: 17, הִנֵּנִי עֹמֵד, *behold ! I was standing*, i. e. during the dream and this representation.

§ 484. (2) The Participle expresses, in connection with other actions, an action continuing during those other actions. Therefore,

(a) In connection with a description of the past, it expresses the *Praeter relative*. In such a condition it can be joined to the preceding clause with a Vav (*and*) prefixed ; בָּאוּ וְלוֹט יָשַׁב, *they came and Lot [was] settling down*, i. e. settled down at that time, Gen. 19: 1. *Then Rebecca hastened and drew [water], and the man was astonished*, וְהָאִישׁ מִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה, i. e. continued to be astonished while she did this, Gen. 24: 21.

The state, moreover, and the longer time within which the following action was done, may be expressed by the Participle, so that the following clause is attached to the Participle by a Vav relative, (unless where pathos of sentiment prevents this, § 478) ; e. g. בָּנֶיךָ אוֹכְלִים, *thy sons were eating, then came a wind*, etc. Job 1: 18, 19. 1 Sam. 2: 13. To the participle

* In later Hebrew, the use of the second Mode in this way went into desuetude ; e. g. Esth. 2: 13, 14.

thus employed עוֹלָד, *during, whilst, continuing*, is often attached, Job 1: 16—18.

In like manner actions that continue while other things take place, may be designated by the Participle in connection with אָשָׁר, כִּי; as in Gen. 47: 14. 39: 6. Seldom does the Participle stand separately in such a sense; as in Deut. 5: 5. Judg. 18: 1.

(b) In like positions in descriptions of the future, it stands for the *Future relative*; as in 1 Sam. 10: 8. 1 K. 1: 14.

(c) Also for the *Present*; as in Ps. 35: 5, 6.

§ 485. The language first begins, and that at a late period, to put before the Participle, when it was employed in respect to the past, the verb הָיָה; and when respecting the future, the verb יִהְיֶה; for in this way the time was more definitely designated, and a kind of independent tense was formed. So when, according to § 484, (a) The Participle stands connected with other actions; as Joshua לְבוּשׁ הָיָה *was clothed and standing, and then he said*, Zech. 3: 3. Job 1: 14. Seldom does this happen, when the participle has a subsequent position and stands more alone; as in 2 Sam. 3: 6. (b) Even without such a connection, the Participle is employed to mark an action *long continuing* during a specified time; as הִיָּיְתָם מִמָּרִים, *ye have [long and constantly] provoked*, Deut. 9: 7. 22: 24. But in narration conducted in this way, by this independent kind of tense, it is sufficient that the verb הָיָה has been once produced, at the beginning of a paragraph; 1 K. 5: 1.

§ 486. From this use of the Participle as a tense, differs entirely the use of it as a *noun*; (even as a noun with the article or in the construct state, although it may also be construed as a verb). It may be a simple noun, as יִשְׁמֵל, *a deserter*; or it may be in apposition with a noun; or it may depend on a noun in the construct state. Used thus as a noun, it includes the idea of a subject and a verb in itself; and therefore is employed in cases where אָשָׁר with the verb might be employed. Specially is it employed in *apposition*, where it attaches itself to the noun more easily than the verb. Since there is properly no distinction of time in it, so it may be used respecting any time; e. g. the *Present*; the *Praeter*, Gen. 27: 33. 1 Sam. 4: 8. 11: 9. Gen. 19: 14; seldom the *Future*, as Ex. 11: 5. 2 K. 3: 27.

REMARKS ON THE PRECEDING ACCOUNT OF THE HEBREW TENSES, BY
M. STUART.

Let us now endeavour to make as brief a recapitulation of the leading ideas exhibited in these remarks of Ewald, as will consist with doing justice to the author and with perspicuity.

(1) His main position is, that the so called Hebrew tenses were not *primarily* designed at all to mark *tense* or *time*, but only *modes of action*.

This is more explicitly avowed in the preceding part of his Grammar; where (in § 193) he says: "Out of the roots of verbs the [Hebrew] language does not construct so many forms as ours for the designation of *tenses* and *modes*. It has, besides the Participle and the Infinitive (both of which belong, in respect to form, to nouns, § 218—§ 223), only two distinct forms [the Praeter and Future]; and these make rather the difference of *MODE* than of *tense*; and hence this should be named the *first and second Mode*."

(2) The first Mode, as thus defined, marks (in itself *aoristically* in the widest sense of the word) *that which is complete, definite, and certain*. The second Mode (*aoristic* in the like way) designates that which is *incomplete, indefinite, and dependent on circumstances*.

On these propositions I have some remarks to make; but I reserve them, as also any others which I may have occasion to make, until I shall have finished the present recapitulation.

(3) THE FIRST MODE (Praeter), in conformity with its fundamental and *modal* meaning, designates, (a) *The Past*, in an absolute and unconditional manner, and without reference or relation to any particular thing. (b) *The Present*, when an action before commenced may and probably will be still repeated. (c) *The Future*, only when the thing is regarded as completed or as altogether and unconditionally certain.

(4) THE SECOND MODE (Future), in conformity also with its general nature, designates, (a) That which is future or yet to come, in the strict sense. (b) Also (by transition of thought into the past), that which was future in such past time. (c) In like manner, the *Paulo-post Future*, or *Futurum praeteritum*, is designated by the second Mode.

But this is not all. Inasmuch as the *second Mode* designates the idea of that which is *incomplete* or *unfinished*, it is conse-

quently adapted to express any thing which is *coming into being* or *taking its rise*, or is (as we say) *in a forming state*. Hence as an action *now doing* is *incomplete*, the second Mode is adapted to express, (d) *The Present*. (e) The mind may look back on things that were being done, etc., in time past, and the second Mode is employed to represent them in that state, (like the Latin Imperfect). (f) As kindred to this, and quite analogous to it, is the case of often repeated action, which is conceived of as a thing that has taken place and will again take place. The expression of this, therefore, is appropriate to the second Mode.

Once more ; that which is *undefined*, that which is dependent on feelings, wishes, circumstances, etc., belongs appropriately to the second Mode. Consequently it is employed, (g) to express the sense of the *Conjunctive* or *Subjunctive* mode. (h) As a ramification of the same general idea, the second Mode also designates the *Optative*, or that which is hortatory, desiderative, jussive, or permissive.

Such is the wide ground that the Praeter and Future occupy in their *simple* state, according to the views of Ewald. But, (5) There is another state in which the usage of the Hebrew has placed them both, without the formality of a different mode of declension. This is by prefixing *Vav relative* to them ; to the Future by Vav with Pattahh and Daghash following it, to the Praeter by Vav with the usual conjunction-vowel, i. e. Sheva. This gives rise to a great variety of expression in both tenses, or (to speak with Ewald) in both Modes.

In § 244, Ewald has stated, that Vav prefixed to the Future by Pattahh and followed by Daghash forte is entirely different from ׀ (*and*) the usual conjunction. In § 245 he has affirmed the same, as to this difference from the common ׀, respecting Vav before the Praeter. In his larger Grammar he gives his solution of the difficulty which apparently arises from the *punctuation* of the Vav being so different in these two cases. He there states (p. 539), that the Vav of the Future (׀) arose from the verb ׀היה, so that ׀יכתב is equivalent to, or the same as ׀היה יכתב, *and it came to pass [that] he would write* = he wrote. The old root of היה he makes to be ׀י; then by syncope we have ׀י; and then ׀י is easily abridged into ׀=׀. In this way the Vav prefixed to the Future received its shape and meaning ; for the Future with this prefixed becomes a compound form, and, like the verb of existence with

the Future tense in Arabic and Syriac, expresses the meaning of the *past*. Ewald, however, does not admit this analogy, because the *Vav conversive* in Hebrew also retains in itself a *copulative* sense (*and*), as well as a *conversive* one.

But there are other difficulties here, which this theory does not explain, and which will be mentioned in the sequel.

(6) *VAV RELATIVE WITH THE FUTURE* always refers to a new rise and originating of an action out of that which precedes. It signifies, (a) *A sequency of time*, (viewing it as *past* time), —a sequency to something that preceded it and that is *aoristically* narrated. But when introduced thus, it may go on successively indicating things that followed one another. (b) It may also designate the *Future* and the *Present*; but this must be shewn by the tenor of the discourse, and lies not in the nature of the form. (c) It indicates *a sequency in respect to thought*; and so it designates a consequence that follows from premises, or an apodosis, or a resuming of the thread of narration which has been interrupted by a clause thrown in.

(d) It must always be preceded by some clause; for it has a sense that must always be *relative*. It matters not, however, what that preceding clause is, whether a verb, a clause without one, or a detached sentiment.

From this view it follows, (a) That where *sequency* is not indicated by the sense, this form of the Future is excluded. Other tenses are then employed. Of course, (f) This future is excluded in a subordinate clause thrown in, which does not advance the narration. So, (g) When such clauses begin with וְאֵלֶּכֶם, כִּי, etc., which constitute as it were a new sentence, inserted not in the regular succession of the discourse. (h) When any word in the sentence or clause must stand *before* the verb, this form (relative Future) is excluded; of course אֲנִי (which always *precedes*) excludes it. But in order to preserve the power of employing the conversive or relative Future in such cases, וַיָּבֹא (and it came to pass) is often inserted before circumstances thus thrown in, e. g. before limitations of time, in some cases before other words, and then the narration may go on again with the relative Future.

(7) *VAV RELATIVE WITH THE PRAETER* is employed when things certain are designated; or things which (if they are yet to happen) are looked upon as certain. In this case the Future precedes as Aorist; and then, the relative Praeter designates, (a) *The Future*. (b) *The Present*, specially in contin-

ued or often recurring actions. Here the verb in any form, or a participle, may precede. (c) The *Conjunctive mode*. (d) The relative Praeter stands after the Imperative mode, in order to designate the action which follows the command.

(8) Of both the relative Tenses it may be said; (a) That they cannot stand in the *beginning* of a discourse, paragraph, etc. (b) Of the relative Praeter we may also say, that when it precedes a Future, and is itself used in a *future* sense, then the Future tense which follows must be taken as an aoristic tense. (c) Instead of וְיָדָה (see § 479) employed so as to preserve the continuity of relative Futures, וְיָדָה (and it shall come to pass) is used in like circumstances, i. e. before clauses denoting limitation of time, etc.

(9) PARTICIPLE OR RELATIVE TENSE. The generic sense denotes something as *continuing, established, enduring*; while the Modes express the development itself of action, etc. Hence the Participle is employed to designate,

(a) The relative Present. (b) The relative Future; one which is speedily to commence—like the Latin Future in *-rus*. (c) The relative Praeter. (d) An action continuing while others were doing or continuing; or a state or condition which lasted while other things took place. (e) The Participle sometimes joins the verb of existence with it, and thus forms a kind of independent tense by itself.

My object in making this summary has been, to facilitate the understanding of the whole subject as represented by Ewald. But on reviewing it, I cannot promise myself that the reader will not be puzzled, at times, and find it difficult to satisfy himself precisely in respect to the object aimed at. If so, I can only say, that he will not probably be more perplexed than I have been, in reading and endeavouring to understand and translate Ewald's remarks. He has so much of tenuous theory and of hair-splitting distinctions, and withal is so negligent as to his style, that it needs a mind more like his own than mine is, to comprehend, certainly to be satisfied with, all the *diaplois* which he makes.

But now to the substance of the matter itself. I begin my remarks by observing, that, for the most part, he has only brought before us *old* things with *new* names, or well known facts with new and sometimes ingenious theories to account for them. This seems to be the tendency of his whole grammati-

cal work. Even in his *Formenlehre*, i. e. that part of his Grammar which has respect to the *forms* of the different parts of speech in the Hebrew language, he has departed from all preceding grammarians—departed so widely, and in some cases (as it seems to me) so arbitrarily, that I believe a beginner in Hebrew would find it next to impossible, by the aid of his Grammar only, to attain to a competent knowledge of the Hebrew forms. Many an interesting, curious, and acute remark he makes, indeed, in the course of his work; but what is new, striking, or curious, is not always *instructive*.

It will be seen, by an attentive perusal of the preceding summary, that Ewald has represented, in one way or another, each of the five forms of the Hebrew verb which he brings to view, as occasionally designating the Present, the Past, and the Future; i. e. he has represented these forms, after all, as being *auristically* employed, in the widest sense of this word. What more or less had Gesenius and others done before him?

Yet he begins by telling us, that *in the proper sense of the word the Hebrew has no tense*. The so called *Praeter* and *Future* were originally nothing more, he says, than *Modes*; the first designating that which is *complete, definite, and certain*; the second, that which is *incomplete, indefinite, and dependent on circumstances*. Why the same things could not in substance be said of the Greek *Praeterites* and *Futures*, I do not know; nor has he given us any specific reason for making a distinction here between the Hebrew and other languages. That which is *future* is of course in some sense *incomplete*; it is also, from the nature of the case, oftentimes *indefinite*, and often likewise it must be *dependent on circumstances*. The *Futures* proper, in all languages must express ideas belonging to this category; nor do I see how they would be *Futures*, unless they did. But more of this in the sequel.

Why then shall we call the *Praeter* and *Future* of Hebrew verbs, the first and second *Mode*? *Mode* is technically defined to mean, in grammar, *the manner of representing an action or being*. Now if the Hebrew tenses are to be called *Modes* because they do this merely in some sense, then the Greek tenses must be called *Modes* for the like reason, and all tenses in any language must be called *Modes*; for all tenses and every tense necessarily express, along with time, some mode of action. Certainly they must do this, unless we say that they do not express action at all. But as we cannot say this

of any verb, in any of its phases, so, it being conceded that action is expressed, some mode of it must also be expressed, for otherwise we must make it out, that definite action can exist and be expressed, and yet a mode of it at the same time not be designated ; which would be merely saying, that an action took place, but not in any mode or manner.

This reasoning, of course, will not apply to the *Infinitive Mode* ; for this, from its very nature, is a *nomen verbale*, and is designed merely to express action without any limitation.

When grammarians say, therefore, that Mode is *the manner of representing action or being*, they do and must have some specific limitations in view, within which this definition will be found intelligible and distinctive. What are these ? They refer, I apprehend, solely to distinction between *positive* and *conditional* assertions, e. g. in Greek the Indicative Mode is declarative and positive, and the Subjunctive and Optative are conditional in some sense or other ; or else they refer to what is *jussive*, e. g. the Imperative Mode in distinction from those just named ; or finally, they make an absolute declaration of simple action limited neither by time nor person, as e. g. the Infinitive. The same *Modes*, in this sense of Mode, may of course exist in the passive voice as in the active ; and accordingly we find them there in Greek, Latin, etc.

It is manifest from this brief view of *Modes*, that *time* and *person* are merely accidental to them ; some have them, viz. the Indicative, etc., and some have them not, viz. the Infinitive. These may accompany the Modes ; for the most part they do ; but they do not constitute an *essential* part, nor strictly speaking any part, of what properly belongs to *Mode* in the sense of grammarians.

Let us now inquire, whether Prof. Ewald has said any thing to shew us, why the Praeter and Future should be called *Modes* ? Is it that the one declares *conditionally* and the other *positively* ? Not at all. Both are equally positive in the great majority of cases, and both are occasionally conditional. Both declare things past, present, and future ; and both occasionally relate them as conditional and incomplete. His own statement shews this. The main distinction on which the actual discrepancy of Modes really rests, is not applicable, therefore, to this case. At least if it be so, it may be as well applied to the Greek tenses as to the Hebrew.

I take for granted, that no speculative philosophy can shew

us any probability, that the Hebrews or any other nation ever employed verbs in all their different forms, without reference to *tense*, i. e. without intending to designate *tense* thereby. An action as conceived of most simply by the mind in its uninstructed state, is viewed either as *past*, *present*, or *future*. Hence the verbs of nearly all languages designate each of these by distinct forms. Even the Hebrew is wont to express the simple present, where the past and future are not at all regarded, by the use of an active participle ; which might be named (as it has been) the *present tense*.

If Prof. Ewald should ask me here, how it comes about that the Hebrew has no *Modes*, i. e. has none on the supposition, that it has *tenses* in the usual sense of that word ; my answer would be, that the distinction of Modes is evidently a later and less obvious thing than the distinction of tense. In many languages the Modes are not expressed at all, or scarcely or very imperfectly so, by the forms of verbs, but are made by adjectitious particles, or helping verbs, which express the sense needed. It would seem, therefore, that there is less need of mode than of tense ; or at any rate, that such has been the feeling of mankind in the formation of many languages.

If this view is correct, then it follows that the theory of Prof. Ewald is, in its own nature, an improbable one. The need of tense would be sooner thought of and felt, than the need of mode ; and it is therefore more probable in itself that modes were left undistinguished in the Hebrew language, than that tenses were.

Nor are we confined to a speculative view of the case. It is easy to produce examples, and many of them too if time were allowed, in which the distinction of *time* is plainly and definitely the great object in view, in the use of the Praeter and Future. Take, for example, Is. 46 : 4. Jehovah is introduced by the writer as saying : ‘ Who hath carried them [the house of Israel] from the womb, who hath held them up from their birth ?’ In the sequel he answers the question : אֲנִי עָשִׂיתִי וְאֲנִי אֶעֱשֶׂה, *I have done [this], and I will do it, or I will uphold them*. So again in v. 11. וְיִצְרֵנִי אֶת אֲבִיָּאֲנִי יִצְרֵנִי אֶת אֲפֻקָּהּ, *I have promised and I will accomplish it, I have formed the plan and I will carry it into execution*. Here plainly the emphatic point of contrast is the *past* and the *future*. God *has done* the one thing in *time past*, and this is the pledge that he *will do* the correspondent thing in *time future*.

Let us return for a moment here, to the consideration of Prof. Ewald's view of the original nature and design of the second Mode, i. e. of the so-called Future. It designates, says he, 'what is *incomplete, indefinite, and dependent on circumstances.*' Now he is safe as to the first of these allegations, indeed, for a tense which designates the proper *future*, must, it is sufficiently obvious, designate what is *incomplete*. But as to *indefinite* here, i. e. in the examples above produced, or the *dependent on circumstances*, what is there to support his view of the subject? *I have done this thing*, i. e. upheld the people of Israel, is no more definite, than *I will uphold them again*. The execution of this promise, a promise uttered by the Almighty God—is not *dependent* on circumstances,—certainly not upon any that we know or can even imagine. The promise involves the idea, that no circumstances shall be such as to prevent the fulfilment of it.

What is true of the Future in the two passages above quoted, is equally true of thousands of Futures in the Old Testament; it is true of nearly all of the unnumbered Futures converted into a Praeter sense by Vav. No imaginable distinction can be made in respect to this class of verbal forms, on the ground of *indefiniteness* or *uncertainty* or *dependence on circumstances*, and the Praeter when employed in its simple aoristic and historic sense.

Does any reader doubt this? Then let him open any where in the Hebrew Bible and make the experiment, for this is the only satisfactory way of testing such matters. We will turn to the first chapter of Genesis; for all concede that the Pentateuch, be it written sooner or later, is one of the finest of all the examples of classical Hebrew style to be found in the Old Testament.

In Gen. 1: 3, we have the first example of a *converted* Future in וַיֹּאמֶר, and [God] said. Now this is no more conditional, nor indefinite, nor dependent on circumstances, nor even incomplete, than when in the preceding verse, the writer says: 'The earth הָיְתָה *was* without form, etc.' The sense here has not one of the attributes ascribed to the second Mode by Prof. Ewald, excepting that it stands in a *sequency* of thought and of time. Of this, more hereafter. Let us confine ourselves, for the present, entirely to the examination of the preceding alleged attributes of the second Mode.

Pass on down the page. Verse 3d gives us וַיֹּאמֶר, and [God]

saw ; וַיִּבְדֵּל, and he caused a separation. Verse 4, וַיִּקְרָא, and he called. Here in this last instance we have, in the corresponding clause which follows it, an instructive exhibition of the true design of that form of the Future tense in question, i. e. when it is employed with Vav. The two clauses of the verse stand thus : ' And God called (וַיִּקְרָא) to the light—day, to the darkness he called (קָרָא) night.' Nothing can be more plain in this case, than that the certainty, the definiteness, and the *sequency*, of both these forms of the same verb here, are precisely the same ; and the only reason that Ewald gives, in such cases, why the *Praeter* form is chosen (as in respect to קָרָא here) is, that it is *preceded* by a word or words (as here by וַיִּבְדֵּל).

We proceed with the converted Futures. In Gen. 1 : 5 (besides those already stated), וַיְהִי twice. In v. 6, וַיֵּאמֶר ; v. 7, וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיִּבְדֵּל, וַיְהִי ; v. 8, וַיִּקְרָא, וַיְהִי twice ; v. 9, וַיְהִי, וַיֵּאמֶר ; v. 10, וַיִּקְרָא, וַיְהִי. And so the reader may go on, through the whole chapter, nay, through the whole Pentateuch and the whole Hebrew Bible, and find numberless examples of the same tenor, i. e. plain, absolute, unconditional, unlimited, unequivocal declarations of facts in time past, and simply *historic aorists*, for aught that I can possibly see, precisely of the like tenor with the Greek Aorists, or other *Praeterites* used in their room.

I am aware of the reply which Prof. Ewald would make to this statement. He would appeal to his account of the *relative Future*, i. e. the Future with Vav conversive as exhibited in § 476 above, and say, that it is a Future *relative* and not absolute, which is indicated by such forms, viz. a Future compared with something in the narration which *preceded* it, and not with the time when the writer is composing his narration. The whole took place in time past, as it relates to the latter point of time ; but the thing designated by the *relative Future* was a proper *sequent* of that which he had before mentioned, and so was *future to that*.

The fact I will, for the sake of discussion, allow. Whether this *sequency* is in truth *always* indicated by the so-called *conversive Future*, as Ewald seems to assert, is a question to which we may hereafter come. For the present we will allow the *relative future* sense ; for in most cases it is undoubtedly a matter of fact.

The fair question now will be, Whether the future form,

without this Vav conversive, does also at times convey a Praeterite sense like that of the relative Future, and is employed where the Praeter might have been used to all intents and purposes with the same significance ?

‘To the law and the testimony ;’ we cannot settle this point on the ground of *theory*. Pass on then in the narration to chap. 2. v. 10: ‘And a river issued from Eden to water the garden, and from thence יִפְרֵד (Niph. Future), *it was divided, and became* four sources.’ Now here is the Future *without* Vav, which designates the *past time* ; and here too is a *sequency*, not of time, perhaps, but at least of idea. The issuing of the river from the garden preceded its division, (we might say, in point of time, but at all events we must say) in point of fact, and in the order of idea and of narration. Accordingly וַיִּהְיֶה, a simple Praeterite with ו (and) before it, is conjoined with the Future form יִפְרֵד, has relation to the same subject or Nominative with that form, and designates the same point of time, because the division itself made the four sources which the narration mentions.

Pass we on to v. 25 of the same chapter ; ‘And the man and his wife were both naked, וְלֹא יָתְבוּשָׁשׁוּ, *and they were not ashamed*. Now here is another *sequency* both of time and of fact. The nakedness precedes ; the unblushing condition of a state of perfect innocence is consequent ; and, so far as the matter before us is concerned, we must say, it is necessarily connected with the former. Now in the clause which immediately precedes the simple Future, we have a *relative* Future, וַיִּהְיֶה ; while here, the ו before the Future is omitted: Here, moreover, is no uncertainty, no indefiniteness ; it is a simple declaration of fact, and, for aught that I can see, differs not in sense at all from what it would signify if the writer had said, וְלֹא יָתְבוּשָׁשׁוּ.

Take another instance from v. 6 of the same chapter : ‘And a mist יַעֲלֶה *went up* from the ground, etc.’ Then follows in the next clause, וַיִּשְׁקֶה, ‘*and watered* the face of the ground.’ Here is a Praeter again, with a simple copula (ו) before it, arranged in the same series of thought, and under the same condition and circumstances as the Future יַעֲלֶה. There is no more uncertainty in the one than in the other ; no more indefiniteness in the one than in the other ; and no more of *sequency* in the one than in the other, i. e. both are *sequencies* in respect to time and in the ideas of the writer.

Let us go, for a moment, into other books. In 2 K. 13: 20 the writer says : ‘ And the bands of Moab **יבאו** *came up to or invaded* the land.’ In the preceding clause are two Futures with Vav conversive, designating the common historic Praeter sense. The narration which exhibits **יבאו** is of the same tenor with them, and stands in like circumstances.

But perhaps the *later* Hebrew of this book will be objected to. Let us go then into Ps. xviii., and see how the usage is there. In v. 6 seq. the writer says : ‘ In my distress **אָרָאָה** *I called upon* Jehovah, to Jehovah **וַיִּשְׁמַע** *did I raise my cry*, **וַיִּשְׁמַע** *he heard* my voice from his temple, and my cry **אָבַח** *came* into his ears. Then did the earth shake and tremble, [two Futures with Vav conversive], and the foundations of the mountains **וַיִּרְגְּזוּ** *trembled*. V. 9, **וַיֵּלֶךְ** *there went up* [simple Praeterite] a smoke through his nostrils, and a fire from his mouth **וַיִּאָכַל** *devoured*, [simple Future in the same circumstances as the preceding Praeter], coals **וַיִּצְרָר** [Praeter] by it.’ Then follow four Futures with Vav conversive. V. 12, **וַיַּשְׁחֶרֶץ** [Future without Vav] ‘ *he made* darkness his hiding place, etc.’

Now nothing can be plainer than that the Praeter, the simple Future, and the Future with Vav, are all employed here in simple narration of the past, in the same way and without any even imaginable distinction as to dependence, succession, conditionality, definiteness, or any thing else of the like nature. It is manifestly a simple, aoristic, Praeterite narration. All theoretical speculations which lead us to adopt the conclusion, that the distinctions of tense are never abandoned in Hebrew, nor the difference of forms ever superseded or neglected, surely fall before such an exhibition as this.

Nor must this be set aside, because it is *poetry*. Poetry, in Hebrew, no doubt allows of some peculiar forms for a few words ; and few indeed they are. But poetry does not violate the fundamental laws of syntax. It is the figurative nature of its representations, the elevation of thought and style, and the rhythmical nature of its structure, which, with these few peculiar forms of words, distinguish poetry from prose. It leaves the laws of Syntax, the great principles of the language, in the main untouched. Irregularities in regard to these laws, whenever they occur, are as frequent in the prose of the Old Testament as in the poetry.

But there are cases even more striking, in some respects,

than any of those produced. These are such as follow particles that actually and definitely express the *time past*. Thus in Josh. 10: 12, **אָז יִדְבָּר**, '*then spake* Joshua ;' Ex. 15: 1, **אָז יָשַׁר**, '*then sang* Moses ;' and so in 1 K. 3: 16. 9: 11. 16: 21, and often elsewhere.

So after **לְפָנֶיךָ**, *before, before that*, the simple Future is often used ; Gen. 2: 5. 24: 45, and often elsewhere. But here, the nature of the particle might afford some ground for the use of the Future.

But Ewald, I am aware, has endeavored to provide against the exigency which would arise from urging such examples as these upon him ; and such might be urged to an extent that hardly admits of any limitation. He tells, in § 473, that the idea of *becoming* this or that, of *originating*, of being in a *forming state*, of *repeated* action, etc., all belong to the Future ; and when an example occurs which would press hard upon him, as to a Praeterite sense of the simple Future, he breaks the force of the pressure by averring, that it is customary in poetry, and sometimes also in prose, to represent actions in *past time* as being then *in a course of performance*, and things as then *originating, developing themselves, or taking their rise*. Accordingly, in order to illustrate this, he appeals to Job 38: 21, 'Knowest thou this because **יָלַדְתָּ יָמֶיךָ** *thou wast then born ?*' An unlucky example, surely, for such a purpose ! Can it be supposed, now, that the speaker meant to say : 'Knewest thou this, because thou wast *in the process* of being born ?' Or, 'because thou wast actually born ?'

He refers us again to Job 3: 3, 'Perish the day **בַּיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר יָלַדְתִּי** *in which I was born.*' Here too we may well ask : Does Job mean to represent himself as in the process of birth on that day, or does he mean to designate the action as completed ? Once more he refers us to Job 3: 11, 'Why did I not die (**לֹא מָוִיתִי**) from the womb ? [Why did I not] expire (**אָגַדְתִּי**) as I came forth from the belly ?' Now whatever might be said in defence of that signification of the simple Future (here are two of them), assigned to it by Ewald, viz., that of *originating, developing itself, etc.*, it must apply, if it is at all applicable, to other verbs as well as to those which signify to *be born*, or to *come into being*. It is not the meaning of a verb, considered in this point of light, which has any thing to do with Mode and Tense. Accordingly, Job not only employs the simple Future to signify his *birth* in time past, but also to designate *death* in time past,

(אָגִיט, אָמִיר). But is it a *continued*, a *repeated* act of death that he wishes for himself, or designates? No more, I answer, can this be supposed, than that the birth before mentioned means a *repeated* birth.

But Ewald presents us with another branch of this meaning of the simple Future, which, as he maintains, springs out of the idea of *becoming* something, *developing*, *originating*, etc. The *Present* tense indicates something, he says, which evidently belongs to this category. It is not what is stationary, done, transacted, but something which is *in doing*, which is *taking rise*, etc. Hence the simple Future may designate this also. The appeal is made to Num. 23: 7, 'From Syria Balak, king of Moab, בָּלָק מֶמְדִּינַת, *conducts me*.' So would he render this last word; but it seems to me quite a plain case, that the *Praeterite* sense is the one here to be given—'Balak hath conducted me—and that is the reason why I am now here present.'

But however unsatisfactory the proof adduced by Ewald may be in this case, yet nothing is more certain than that the Future does often designate the Present; e. g. לֹא אֲדָע, *I know not*, 1 K. 3: 7. So Is. 1: 13, לֹא אֶחְכַּל, *I cannot*; Prov. 15: 20, 'A wise son יְשִׁמְחֵהוּ *maketh glad his father*, etc.' But is this merely in consequence of the peculiar sense given to the so-called second Mode? Not at all; the *Praeter* often has the sense of the Present too; e. g. יָדַעְתִּי *I know*, קָטָן *he is small*, Ps. 1: 1, 'Blessed is the man who *walketh* not (לֹא יֵלֵךְ) in the counsel of the ungodly, who *standeth* not (לֹא עֲמֹד) in the way of sinners, who *sitteth* not (לֹא יֹשֵׁב) in the seat of scorers.' And so in cases without number.

Even so is it, moreover, with the *relative* Future, as Ewald enjoins it upon us to name it. E. g. 'And the land אֶרֶץ מְלֵא is *full* of silver,' etc., Is. 2: 7, 8. So וַיִּתְאַבֵּל *and mourns*, in 2 Sam. 19: 2; et saepe alibi.

With such facts as these before us, how shall we concede to the Future the designation of the Present, on the peculiar ground that it signifies what is *originating* or *developing itself*, etc.? Has not the Present the same sense, when it is designated by the *Praeter*, the Future relative, and the Participle, which last confessedly designates it in instances beyond enumeration? It is sometimes said, that 'it is a poor rule which will not work both ways;' and whatever limitations this maxim may have, in the case before us, it is impossible to shew that the designation of the Present tense belongs to the Future on the

ground of something appropriate to the nature of the Present tense, and yet that the Praeter and relative Future and Participle all designate the Present—without any good reason for it, or for a different reason from that which belongs to the designation by the simple Future.

I have said enough to shew, that there is no stable ground to support the assertion, that the simple future form may not be employed to designate the *past* and the *present*. It is thus employed in a multitude of cases. And if the reason given by Ewald, why it is so employed, is a good one, then I might assume a position like Ewald's in respect to the appropriate meaning of the Praeter, and the relative future, and argue from this that they designate the Present because it contains this appropriate sense. What proves too much, does not prove—quite enough.

But let us now examine, for a moment, another of the leading positions of Prof. Ewald, in regard to the use of the tenses; viz., that when Vav conversive precedes the Future, it always (stets) develops the idea of *becoming*, of *taking rise*, or *originating*, and so the composite form in question describes the rise or origination of an action out of some foregoing one, § 476.

But this general position is somewhat modified, by his afterwards telling us, that such a relative Future may designate either a sequency in respect to *time*, or one in respect to *ideas*.

One would have naturally understood him to mean, by his first general affirmation, that *causation*, or rather *the effect which follows causation*, is exclusively designated by the relative Future. But still we will not insist on this; for he has a right to his own definitions and limitations. A sequency in *point of time*, then, is one thing designated; the other is, sequency in respect to ideas in the mind, i. e. conclusions drawn from premises, or apodosis completing a protasis, as he himself explains it, § 476. And this relation to something antecedent and what immediately precedes, is indispensable, as he evidently appears to state the matter, to the use of the relative Future, i. e. the Future with Vav conversive.

But is this so? Let us examine several cases which readily present themselves. In Gen. 2: 8, the writer tells us, that "Jehovah planted a garden in Eden, toward the East, and *there he placed the man whom he had made*; and there Jehovah God made to grow from the ground every tree pleasing to the sight and good for food, etc." The writer goes on, in verses

10—14, to describe the river which flowed from the garden, and the four rivers that were disparted from it. After this, in verse 15, he again resumes the thread of his narration; ‘And Jehovah *took* וָיִקַּח (relative Future) the man, וְיִצְחָק, and *brought* him into the garden, etc.’ Here then is not a *sequency* in the narration. This same fact had been already stated in verse 8; and after this statement, other things, viz., the growth and flourishing of the plants, etc., are related as matters that took place *subsequent* to the introduction of man into the garden. But in verse 15 the placing of man in the garden is again stated, and of course this is something which *preceded*, not which followed, the growth of the plants, etc. Should it be said that the matter in verses 10—14 gives occasion to the relative Futures in verse 15, the answer is, that this matter is of such a nature, and so independent of the tenor of the narrative, that there is no proper *sequency* here, nor is there a relative Future, nor a וָיִהְיֶה (§ 479 above) to keep up the *sequency* in question.

But if any one is still disposed to doubt whether a *Pluperfect* sense can be given to the relative Future here, let him pass on to Gen. 12: 1, ‘Now Jehovah *had said* (וַיֹּאמֶר) to Abraham: Get thee out of thy country, etc.’; yet the two verses of the narrative which immediately precede this, viz. Gen. 11: 31, 32 tell us, that Sarah had, some time before this, left Ur of the Chaldees and gone out with Abraham to Haran, where the former died. So here is not *sequency* in וַיֹּאמֶר, but *regression*; for it reverts to something which happened before Sarah and Abraham left Ur, (comp. Acts 7: 2, 3), and is therefore, as to *meaning*, a proper Pluperfect.

Again, in Gen. 24: 29 it is stated that ‘Laban ran out to meet the man (Abraham’s servant) at the well.’ Yet in the succeeding verse (v. 30) it is said; ‘*it came to pass*, וַיְהִי, that when Laban saw the rings upon the fingers of his sister Rebecca, etc., וַיֵּצֵא, that *he went out* to the man, etc.’ Beyond all question the narrative in the thirtieth verse exhibits facts which *precede* what is stated in the latter part of the 29th verse.

In Gen. 27: 23 it is stated that ‘Isaac *blessed* (וַיְבָרֵךְ) Jacob.’ Then in vs. 24 seq. is related all the *previous* conversation on this occasion, and this narration begins with a וַיֹּאמֶר, *for Isaac had said*, etc.

In Gen. 24: 61, It is said: ‘And Rebecca arose, and her maidens, and they rode upon the camels, and went after the

man [the servant of Abraham], וַיִּקַּח and the man *took* Rebecca and departed.' Now here the action of taking her and commencing his departure, surely preceded the riding upon the camels and going after the servant in question.

So in Is. 48: 18, 19, 'O that thou hadst listened to my commandments! וַיִּיָּדֶי then *had been* thy peace like a river, etc., and thy seed וַיִּיָּדֶי *had been* as the sand of the sea, etc.' But here Ewald would probably say, that the וַיִּיָּדֶי designates an event subsequent to the *listening* which is mentioned.

Enough of examples of a *Pluperfect* sense of the Future with Vav. It were easy to multiply them, did my limits permit. If any one doubts, let him take up his Hebrew Bible and read on, with attention, through a few pages, and watch the development of this so-called relative Future, independently of any system or theory in respect to it. If he does not then give up the theory of Prof. Ewald, it will not be for want of evidence that it will not abide the test of experiment.

It would be easy to call in question, and (as it seems to me) to render altogether doubtful, several other positions of Ewald, in respect to the Future tense. But as these are only some of the fine-spun threads of his web, and too tenuous to give it much support or consistency, I pass them by, lest I should exhaust the patience of the reader.

Will he indulge me, however, while I briefly examine some of the positions of this learned Professor, in respect to the *Praeter* tense, or (as he names it) *first Mode*?

He begins by telling us, that 'it designates only what is *complete, definite, and certain*,' § 471. Yet in § 472 he concedes, that the *Praeter* sometimes stands as a designation of the Future; but it is only when that Future is viewed by the mind as already in effect *completed*, or, at least, it must be absolutely and unconditionally certain that it will be completed.

It would seem from this account of the future sense of the *Praeter*, that when it is so employed there arises an *intensity* of signification in consequence of it. The *certainty* is grounded, in the view of the writer, (at least this seems to me to be Ewald's view of the case), on the foundation of a divine assurance; so that the use of a *Praeter* in this way could hardly be proper, except in words represented as spoken by the divine Being himself, or by others speaking merely by his authority.

Now as to the fact, that in predictions, assurances, or promises, etc., the *Praeter* is often employed in a Future sense, this

is so evident that all acknowledge it; and it is conceded by Ewald himself in § 472; so that it is unnecessary for me to make any effort to prove it. But still I have a question to ask here, which relates to this subject; viz. How comes it, that in the same prediction, such Praeterites as those now before us and also proper Futures are commingled? Is the one more intense and certain than the other? And if not, how can *this* be a ground for employing the Praeter in the place of the Future, where a proper future sense is to be conveyed?

Take for example Is. 9: 1, 'The people who were walking in darkness *shall* see (רָאוּ) a great light; and as to those who dwelt in the land of the shadow of death, light *shall shine* (נִגְלוֹ) upon them, etc.' Then follow other verbs of the like form and with a *future* sense; then some with a present sense (by transfer of the scene of action); then simple future forms, and then others still with Vav conversive. All this in one and the same picture of future events, all of which are equally definite and certain.

So again in Is. 5: 13, 'Therefore my people אֲלֵה, *shall go into captivity* therefore Hades *shall enlarge herself* (הִקְרְחִיבָהּ), etc.' Then follow פָּעֲרָה . . . יָרֵד in a *future* sense; and then immediately succeed וַיֵּשֶׁב . . . וַיִּשְׁפַּל . . . וַיִּשְׁפָּלָהּ, etc. all Futures relative, yet all in the same prediction, and in the same circumstances as to *certainty*, etc., as the Praeterite forms which had been before employed. See also Is. 5: 25, 26, where the same phenomenon again occurs; and so in Is. 11: 1—10, and often elsewhere.

Ewald asserts, that all the cases where the Praeter is thus employed, are of that class which have been described above, i. e. that they are all cases of absolute certainty, and are looked upon as already accomplished for that reason. Yet when the proper Future, the relative Future, and the participle are employed in the very same prediction, and all respect parts of one and the same great occurrence, parts that are all equally certain — all equally definite — how is it in the nature of possibles to make a distinction such as Ewald here makes, in regard to the Praeterites employed to designate the Future? I say again, that which proves too much — does not prove enough.

Such is Ewald's statement respecting the simple Praeter, and such the grounds for calling it in question. But there is another view which he has given us of *the Praeter with Vav prefixed*, (§ 480 seq.), which claims and should receive some of our attention.

To the Praeter of this class he assigns the task of designating what is certain, or, if it be yet to happen, what is as good as completed, in the view of the speaker. Here then, as the use of such a Praeter is one of the most frequent of all the Hebrew forms in respect to the designation of actions that are future, it is evident we must have a large multitude of *intensive* declarations in the Scriptures. Every where *certainty* becomes the reigning order of the day. There is scarcely room left for opinion, or softened forms of speech, or conditionalities of things, but almost all is either certain, or looked upon as absolutely so.

My first remark on this view of the subject is, that no language abounds, or can abound, with such an unlimited mass of *intensives*. Where all is intensive, nothing is so; and where such a vast proportion is intensive, as this form of the Praeter would constitute in Hebrew sentences, emphasis must be nearly out of question. So much of it — makes none.

But I have difficulties, also, with other views of Prof. Ewald, in relation to this form of the Praeter. He says (§ 480), that ‘when this relative Praeter is employed to designate a *future* sense, it is a more definite and decisive form than the relative Future.’ I do not understand him here. Does he mean that it designates the Future more decisively or definitely than the Future with Vav conversive designates it? He cannot mean this, I think, because he does not assign a *future* sense to this relative Future, if I rightly apprehend him. He must mean, then, that the relative Praeter is more definite in the expression of the meaning which it designates, than is the relative Future. If this be the meaning, I am quite at a loss to know what can be said which will confirm such an assertion.

The *fact*, that the Praeter with Vav stands, in cases without number, to designate actions future, is so beyond all question, that neither Ewald nor any other Hebrew scholar will attempt to deny it. But the marked distinction of the future, when designated by this form of the verb, is what is peculiar to Ewald and his followers, and is what now claims our examination.

Let us begin with the very example which he adduces in order to confirm his statement, viz. $\text{וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיִּלָּחֶם}$, *he will go, and then he will fight*. I ask now, whether it is more certain and definite that he will *fight*, than that he will *go*? Or is it certain at all events that he will fight, and yet uncertain whether he will go? Open the Hebrew Bible any where, and examine the tenor of the discourse. E. g. Is. 1: 19, ‘*If ye shall be*

willing (וְאַתָּה תֹאמַר), *and will hearken* (וְשָׁמַעְתָּ), ye shall eat the good of the land. But if *ye shall refuse* (וְאַתָּה תִּמְאָר), *and shall be refractory* (וְיָמְרִיתָ), the sword shall devour, etc.' But it would be a waste of time to adduce evidence here, which every paragraph of the Hebrew Bible proffers to our view.

Once more ; Ewald says that this form of the Praeter designates in a peculiar and appropriate manner, and indeed that it is one of its principal offices to designate, *actions which are repeated and continued*, (§ 480. 2.) Let us take, then, the very example which he offers as confirming this, viz. 'A mist *וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיִּשְׂקֶה* *went up and then it watered* the face of the ground, etc.,' Gen. 2: 6. Now here it is no more certain that the mist *watered* the ground, than it is that it *went up* ; and surely the action of watering was no more *continued* or *habitual* than the action of going up. The latter was the only ground and cause of the former. Yet the *going up* is expressed by the simple Future, used as a Praeterite, and the watering by a Praeter with Vav before it, and employed in its usual Praeterite sense.

In the same manner, it would be easy to shew, are numberless cases of the Praeter with Vav construed ; and the question, whether they are to have a praeterite sense or a future one, is decided, as seems plain to me, not by the fact of being prefixed by a Vav, but by the sense of the verb which precedes at the commencement of the sentence or the clause in which they stand. For illustration, I refer the reader to the cases just produced above, from Is. 1: 19, where the Future form with a future sense precedes, and therefore the Praeter with Vav which follows has a future sense with a praeterite form. Long ago, indeed, was this remarked, and established, as one might think, by Hebrew grammarians ; but Ewald has strong desires to exhibit something 'new under the sun.' Yet new things are not always true things ; and most palpably, here his distinctions are made without a difference for their basis.

There is room for criticism, on nearly every position which he advances, that has any thing peculiar in it. Not that I dispute the fact, in any case, that the different forms of the tenses do in more or less instances designate ideas such as he assigns to them. This is not his error. It consists in making them mark *peculiarly* or *exclusively* such ideas, and the consequent (at least the implied) seclusion of other forms of the Hebrew verb from performing such an office.

How easy now to reverse the whole process, and throw back on him the burden of proof! If I should say, that the simple Future denotes appropriately such action as is habitual and often repeated, I could advert to numerous examples in the Hebrew Bible, as every critic knows, by which I could confirm my position. Suppose then I assume the position, that this is the distinguishing and characteristic trait of the Future, and aver that all other forms of verbs which designate the same sense, such as the simple Praeter, and the Praeter with Vav, do it accidentally and by a kind of enallage in usage, etc; why is not my ground in all respects as firm and tenable as that of Prof. Ewald? I cannot see why it would not be so; nor do I apprehend that my error could be made more palpable than his.

Such is the result of a brief examination of this celebrated Hebrew critic, in relation to this highly interesting and important topic of Hebrew Grammar. His views are novel, in some respects; not as to facts, but as to the alleged reasons or grounds of them. Every thing is reduced to theory; and theory has an all-pervading and overpowering influence. Hence the attraction which his Grammar possesses for a certain class of the German critics. The inclination of a large portion of *literati* in Germany is strongly set towards theory in every thing. Even when it degenerates into mere imagination and conceit, if it be ingenious, it does not seem to stand in the way of many, nor to be the less acceptable. And so here, in the case of Ewald; his Grammar is, in the eyes of many, an absolute *nonpareil* of perfection. Gesenius, and all who have preceded or followed him, with the exception of Ewald, are tame, dull, old-fashioned writers, who have advanced no further than *agere actum*. It is the theory of this new adventurer, which has become in grammar, what the *Principia* of Newton became in philosophy. When one contemplates facts like these, how can he help thinking of what Madame de Stael has so characteristically said of the Germans: "The Englishmen live on the water; the Frenchmen on the land; but the Germans—in the air."

In our own country too, the same changes have been occasionally rung, and in quarters where the doctrines of past ages do not often meet with a ready abandonment. We have been told that "Gesenius has already become *antiquated*;" and when this has been doubted, and a venture made to call it in question, with an appeal to facts, then we have had an earnest and hearty

defence of such a position. Yet after all, the arguments employed in this defence, have been deduced only from what was before conceded, viz., from the favourable opinions of a certain class of critics in Germany in respect to Ewald ; and in this way a confirmation of the declaration respecting Gesenius has been attempted. ‘ Si non Superos — Acheronta movebo.’

I grant that there are such critics. But are not the like things to be found in all—or nearly all—the other branches of literature in Germany. Where is Kant now ? Or Fichte, or Jacobi ? And where will Schelling and Hegel be, the next generation ? It does not come with a very good grace from those, who keep on with such anxious solicitude in the paths of 1520—60, and hereticate all who take the liberty of retreating merely now and then into some small nook which diverges from the old road, either for the purpose of rest or refreshment under some inviting shade there, to strike off with such velocity into the mazes of a comet, which leads so far beyond the boundaries of our “ visible and diurnal sphere.”—Sed — manum de tabula.

A few suggestions more, and I have done.

It has been often said, and with much truth, that it is easier to pull down a building than to erect one. It may seem to the reader, perhaps, that I have been merely engaged in the work of demolition, and that, even if I have succeeded, I have not proposed any other theory in the place of Ewald’s. This is partly true. My positions have only been of such a nature, in general, as to shew that my views differ widely from his ; not as to simple facts, but as to the mode of accounting for them. But still, by all this the way has been prepared, as I would fain hope, for the introduction of a few remarks, which belong rather to the category of the *thetic*, than that of the *antithetic*.

I begin then by remarking, that an attentive examination of the *actual use*, (not the theory), of the Hebrew tenses has led me unavoidably to the conclusion, that while there are definite and distinct uses of the Praeter as such and of the Future as such—so definite in certain cases that no other form could be employed—yet there is a wide and broad ground in which the form of the verb, whether Praeter or Future, with Vav or without, is treated in a manner altogether *aoristic*, i. e. unlimited as to *time*, and the sense in this respect is to be gathered from the context and the strain of the discourse. Take the same narration, or the same strain of prediction, and you will find simple Praeter and Future, relative Praeter and Future, and

Participle also, all employed to express the very same relations as to time. This cannot be denied ; and no tenuous distinctions between the one and the other will abide the test of critical scrutiny. *Theory* may make distinctions ; but plain common-sense reasoning will not sanction them.

I would lay it down then as a rule of great extent, for the interpreter of the Hebrew, that he is to look to the *context*, and to that in connection with the nature of the case, in order to determine by what tense he shall render the Hebrew verb, when any doubt arises. I venture a remark, too, on this rule which some will be ready to assail as too indefinite ; and this is, that there is not one case in a hundred, where the reader of Hebrew will ever doubt for a moment by what tense he is to translate a verb, let the *form* of it be what it may.

I have tried the experiment many scores of times, even with tyros in Hebrew. I have asked them : Do you find any difficulty in knowing by what tense you must translate a Hebrew verb ? The answer has nearly always been : None. And so it must be, in the great mass of cases which are presented in the Hebrew Scriptures.

If this is so easy, then, even for a foreigner and a comparative *stranger* to the Hebrew, how much easier must it have been for a native ? The doctrine of Greek quantity in the tragic poets, and even the epic, is difficult enough for a student of the present day ; but the great mass of an Athenian audience at the theatre, would detect in an instant the smallest errors in quantity or in accent. A native Hebrew would in like manner, when taught by practice, manage as well with his five forms of tenses, (if indeed there are so many), as a Greek would with his wonderful apparatus of tenses and modes.

The fact that there are but two substantially different forms of tense in Hebrew, (if we exclude the Participle from being ranked as a tense), does in itself offer evidence to the mind, that the Hebrews must have given these two different forms a great latitude of meaning. One cannot even imagine that there can be any great difference of conception in the human mind, or among different nations, about the modes of action. All nations must have verbs that designate, either by form or usage, positive and conditional action. They must in some way too be expressive of time past, present, or future. If they have not the *forms* adapted to express all this, then it must be left to the

surrounding context to point out such an interpretation of the verb. And this, in most cases, is a thing so obvious, that many of the Greek tenses seem to be almost superfluous. In fact actual usage made them so. In the active and middle voices, for example, we have never but *one* future which is actually employed; comparatively seldom is it in the Passive, that more than one Future is actually in use; and of the Aorists scarcely ever more than one is employed as belonging to one and the same voice. Even the use of the second Aorist in the *passive* voice, renders it decisive that no second Aorist *active* is or can be employed of that same verb; and the remark is altogether common among grammarians that no Greek verb, or at most, scarcely any one, in the whole language, ever employs all its modes and tenses.

Yet all the various significations that needed to be expressed were expressed by the few tenses only, which are in many instances employed. So true is this, that the verbs mostly in common use, such as *οἶδα, γινώσκω, ἔρχομαι, εἶμι, γινώσκω*, etc., are almost without exception those which are most defective, and have the fewest forms. This is demonstration that the want of the power of expression was not felt, when the number of forms employed was quite small.

Thus also was it, doubtless, with the Hebrews. They had but *two* distinct forms of tense; and in this respect we may say their verbs were inferior in their structure to those of the occidental languages. But then, before we pass sentence upon them *as a whole*, we must take into view the Piel and Pual, the Hiphil, Hophal, and Hithpael forms of the verb, which gave variety and intensity of signification to it such as our language cannot at all reach with their *verbal* forms, and scarcely attain with our ample apparatus of adverbs.

In respect to these various methods and ways of conveying significations, different languages throughout the world vary from each other. Yet after all, the essential and substantial part of *verbal* significations must be alike in all languages, be their forms more or less in respect to number.

As a further proof how little of absolute necessity there is of so many variations as the Greek (for example) employs, consider for a moment the variety of meanings attached, as all now concede, to the *Infinitive absolute* of the Hebrew. Here one form only may designate every mood, tense, number, gender,

and person. Did the Hebrews feel any embarrassment or uncertainty in thus employing it? None whatever, I apprehend; for we feel none now in thus interpreting it.

But I shall be inquired of here, no doubt, by such as may hesitate respecting some of these positions, how it comes about, that the Praeter and Future could sometimes be distinctively, appropriately, and even antithetically used, and yet at other times merged as it were in one common and indefinite usage, and appropriated to designate the sense of all the tenses? How, it will be said, can any reader know when one of these usages is to be adopted, and when another?

The answer is easy. How can any one know when **רָם**, for example, has (in Kal) an *active* sense, and when a *passive* one? In other words, how can he know when to translate it *to exalt*, and when *to be exalted*? The form is identical, the conjugation the same, in both cases. Yet the reader has no difficulty in either case. The context and the exigency of the passage always give him the obvious clue to the meaning in any particular instance.

So was and is it with the Hebrew tenses. The context, the relation of the clause, the exigency of the passage, point us at once to the sense; just as when the Infinitive absolute is employed, the question how it is to be understood is solved at once by the circumstances in which it is employed.

Nor is this usage singular or strange, which gives to the Praeter and Future at times a sense wholly diverse, and in some respects even opposite, while at other times and in other circumstances their meanings are identical, or at any rate so nearly so that no specific difference can be fairly pointed out. We may take, as an exhibition of the like principles, some of the Greek particles; e. g. *καί* and *δέ*. Both are often employed as particles of *transition* from one sentence and subject to another, in the thread of discourse, and yet of connection between the same. Both indicate continuity of thought and representation in some respects, while they point out diversity or separation in some others. Yet *δέ* is never employed as a copula in connecting several Nominatives, for example, or subjects of a verb together; here the office of *καί* or some equivalent (as *τε*) is exclusive; nor is *δέ* employed in connecting the predicates of a sentence together, or the objects which follow a transitive verb. While these two particles, then, occasionally, and even often-

times, occupy common ground, they differ widely in many respects.

So it is also with many other words ; e. g. *δέ* and *γάρ*, etc. So is it, too, with many nouns, verbs, and adjectives. In some one of their meanings they become synonymous with some other words ; in other meanings they are widely discrepant. If you ask, how then can they be distinguished ? I answer, by the tenor of the discourse and the nature of the case where they are employed.

I can therefore imagine no serious difficulty in the way of the supposition that has been made, viz., that the Hebrew forms of tenses could be employed, as occasion required, in every sense as it regards the expression of *time*.

The very fact that the Hebrew had so few forms of tense, obliged him thus to do. Just as the imperfect verbs of the Greek obliged him to use the Imperfect, or the Perfect, or the Aorist, as the case might be, for all the Praeterites ; and the second Future Middle for all the active Futures. Was his discourse rendered obscure by this ? I trust not.

Our subject should not be dismissed, however, without some remarks on that "Proteus" Vav, which so commonly designates a Praeterite sense by a Future form, and gives to the Praeter a Future sense.

The common theory in respect to the *ו* prefixed to the Future, is detailed in all the recent Grammars. The substance of it is, that this is a relic of *וְהָיָה* to *be*, and that the Future is in reality constituted, when *ו* is prefixed, by two forms of verbs ; so that *וְיָקַטַל* = *וְהָיָה יָקַטַל*. i. e. *it was [that] he would kill*.

In respect to the Vav before the *Praeter*, this origin is not pretended by Gesenius and others who follow him. Here *ו* is the proper conjunction ; while still a change is wrought in the verb, both as to the place of its tone, and as to the time which it designates.

Ewald, as stated above on p. 147, derives the *ו* of the Future relative from *וְהָיָה*. Still neither this method, nor that of Gesenius, accounts for all the phenomena. When Gesenius refers us to the kindred languages (*Lehrgeb.* p. 293), viz. the Syriac and Arabic, for examples of Futures with a Praeterite sense formed by the help of the verb *to be*, he does not account for all the difficulty of the matter in Hebrew. How comes it, I ask, that Vav before both the Praeter and Future always bears the signification of *and*, or at any rate of the Hebrew *ו* con-

tain a greater variety in the mode of expressing the past or the future, than either we, or even the Geeeks, have ever been able to reach.

Let me not be understood to say, that all these forms are employed *promiscuously* or *ad libitum*. By no means. Delicacy and propriety of expression did not at all admit of this; nor can I doubt in the least, that there was some definite reason in the mind of the Hebrew, whenever he employed one form rather than another, arising either out of the agreeableness of variety, or out of the circumstances of the case, the mode and form of the expression, the antecedence^o of adverbs, subjects to verbs, qualifying clauses, particles, or something of the like nature, which always rendered it a matter of propriety and elegance to choose this and refuse that. But how far these matters went, and where they reached the metes and bounds which limited good usage, has not yet been sufficiently investigated, certainly not disclosed. Ewald has given some fine hints in respect to many particulars. I wish most sincerely that such a writer as Gesenius would pursue the subject, and give us something more definite, palpable, intelligible, and well-grounded.

But there may be some of my readers, who will be disposed to say, that ‘my view of the Hebrew tenses is too much like Father Simon’s picture of the Hebrew language;’ who in order to give the mother-church at Rome the right of making her own interpretation of the Scriptures, maintained, that because the Hebrew language every where presents words which have several different meanings, there never can be any certainty as to any one of these. The church therefore must decide which of these meanings shall be adopted. So here; if the Hebrew Future may become a Praeterite and a Present, and so *mutatis mutandis* of the Praeter, then he will exclaim, ‘we have a *nodus deo vindice dignus*,—and to which of all the powers above or below shall we make the appeal?’

Such, I say, may be the views of some; for such views have been often presented to the public. Yet a little experience in Hebrew and some tolerable knowledge of other languages, will soon quiet any apprehensions in relation to this difficulty. I have already remarked, that in translating the Hebrew the difficulty is scarcely felt, even by a tyro; so easily does the context determine what must be the tense by which we should translate the verb. But if there be a difficulty still, it belongs also in no small degree to the other sacred language, viz. the Greek, as well as to the Hebrew.

Need any well-informed Greek scholar be told, that the interchange or enallage of tenses is a phenomenon far enough from being uncommon in the Greek? For example; the Present is used for the Praeter and for the Future. It sometimes supplies the place even of the Imperfect, with its peculiar signification. The Imperfect is sometimes employed for the Aorists, and for the Present which denotes duration; the Perfect is employed as an Aorist, and often for the Present;—the Aorist is not unfrequently used for the Pluperfect, for the Future, and even for the Present; the Future is used for the Present, and often to designate, not what *will be* done, but what *ought to be* done. It would prolong the present discussion beyond all proper bounds, for me here to exhibit a detailed proof of all this. I must refer my readers, therefore, to my N. Testament Grammar, § 125; to Matthiae's Greek Grammar, Syntax, § 500 seq.; and to Winer's New Testament Grammar in relation to the use of the tenses. If he consults all these sources where examples are presented, no doubt can any longer exist, that such usages are spread far and wide over the domain of the Greek language; I will not say, so far as in the Hebrew, but I will venture to say—much further than any inattentive observer would even suspect.

Yet no one complains of the *obscurity* and *ambiguity* of the Greek on this account; and for a good reason, because little or no obscurity arises from this source. The context forces the true sense upon the mind of the intelligent reader.

So was it, as I fully believe, with the Hebrew. He could manage as well, with his two *original* forms of tense, and the two adjectitious ones made by prefixing ׀ (the leading design of which was for the most part to make the appeal to the preceding context), and also the Participle and the Infinitive Mode, to express his views intelligibly and plainly, as we can with all our apparatus of *may* and *can* and *shall* and *will* and *ought* and *must* and *should* and *could* and *would*. That his language was more brief and energetic than ours, follows as a matter of course.

We abide then by the old theory of the Hebrew tenses, at least until we obtain a better one. If Ewald's theory is true, it will not help us any in translating or even in understanding the Hebrew. It will embarrass us, on the contrary, in multitudes of places, because we shall be unable to reconcile them with it. Yet, with all my conviction that Prof. Ewald has failed to satisfy the just demands of philology, in the exhibition of his views,

I pay him the tribute of acknowledgment in respect to ingenuity and independence of mind. But I cannot go voluntarily into the dark path whither he invites me, until he lights up at least some brighter lanterns, or else brings the sun-beams to shine upon it.

ARTICLE VIII.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

By Robert B. Patton, Professor of Greek Literature in the University of New York City.

It cannot be doubted that the limited usefulness of our universities and colleges, and the circumscribed range of the studies and literary productions of their professors, are owing, in a great measure, to a deficiency of that invigorating intellectual aliment, which a large Library is intended to supply. The private studies of the professors cannot have that ample range which is necessary to give to their departments the interest and variety of which they are susceptible. Our public libraries, generally speaking, are not adapted to the present improved condition of the departments over which the professors preside; but present a condition of things far below the interesting point to which they have been raised by the elaborate researches of European scholars, the results of which are deposited on the shelves of transatlantic libraries. No wonder, then, that our professors shrink from an attempt so manifestly beyond their means to accomplish, and confine their literary labors to the most elementary productions. To the want of adequate libraries of reference, and not to an indifference to the great interests of literature and science, we must, in justice, attribute the much regretted fact, that our professors, who are not wanting, we believe, in talents or industry, or enterprise, are slow to venture into the arena of learned and profound authorship. We could present the names of more than one of our literary men, who have wept in secret over this desolation;—who have travelled through the length and breadth of the land, to obtain access to some important work of reference, to enable them to put forth a work worthy of their station and the present condition of their

respective departments, and have returned to their homes in disappointment and despondency, abandoning for the present all hope of accomplishing their noble undertaking.

On the other hand, those who superintend the training of the youth in our universities and colleges are aware of the fact, that the most active and highly gifted minds among the students, having easily mastered the common course of instruction, and having nothing to invite them into the vast field beyond, sink into indolence, and not unfrequently into vice.

It is frequently asserted that the American people are eminently "*a reading community*." The truth of the remark is incontrovertible; and while we deplore the limited range of study and effort to which our literary men are necessarily confined, and acknowledge our vast inferiority to the countries of Europe on the score of public libraries and depositories of the learning of by-gone ages, we cannot but exult in the fact, that our private dwellings, whether in the crowded city, the retired village, or the solitary abode of the adventurer in "the far west,"—from the splendid mansion of wealth and luxury, to the humble cot of indigence and toil—are furnished with popular literary works, and those, too, for the most part, of a decidedly moral and religious character.

This circumstance, for which we are mainly indebted to the benign operation of our common school system, has already exerted a propitious influence in familiarizing our whole population with the advantages of literary culture, and in creating a thirst for more extended knowledge and higher intellectual cultivation. And what has been the result? Our whole country, with but few exceptions, presents, as it regards our literary culture, the aspect of an almost unbroken level. "*So high shalt thou ascend, and no higher*" must be said to every aspiring student, longing to reach the more elevated regions of comprehensive and successful research.

Thus, if we mistake not, the very fact to which, as citizens of this favored land, we point with honest exultation, as the fruit of our free institutions, now calls upon us with a voice that cannot be mistaken, to complete the noble structure of which we have laid the broad foundation, by establishing a vast storehouse of learning, an ample library of reference, by means of which the level of general information may, to a certain extent, be broken up;—not by depressing any portion below its present elevation, but by affording an opportunity for such portions

as may demand it, to raise themselves above the surrounding crowd. And this, we contend, is the very essence of our liberal institutions—to furnish opportunities and facilities for a generous competition, and a free development of talent, in every department of enterprise, whether physical or mental.

Again, the stupendous literary collections of Europe owe their origin, or, at least, their present imposing character, to munificent royal endowments and princely patronage, or positive legislative enactments, adapted to the genius and character of European governments, but which, we fear, will be looked for in vain, under a government like that of which we boast. One fact alone will show how such enactments and patronage may gradually swell the size of a public library, and secure to it the possession of the literature of the day in every department. The fact alluded to is this, that the universities of Oxford and Cambridge in England, and that of Edinburgh in Scotland, are entitled, by the existing copy-right law of the realm, to receive a copy of every printed work of which a copy-right is secured. But how different in the aspect of our political institutions! The very feature of our political character in which, as Americans, we have occasion to exult, is at variance with public endowments, foundations, or enactments, except so far as the common weal is literally concerned, and each individual member of the community, as well as the whole mass of our population, is personally and vitally interested. This broad line of demarkation, whose existence we should certainly deplore, if we could avail ourselves of no other resources, but which, under existing circumstances, we regard as essential to our political welfare, constitutes one of our strongest arguments in favor of the private munificence to which we appeal for the accomplishment of this noble object. It furnishes even now an imposing spectacle to the European statesman, to behold the numberless enterprises in which our citizens cheerfully embark their time and wealth and labor, calculated to promote the moral and religious welfare of our community, without a helping hand or a cheering smile from “the powers that be.” Will, then, our citizens shrink from an enterprise which proposes, as its aim, an elevated standard of literary character and intellectual worth throughout our country,—impressed as they must be with the conviction that, if it be not accomplished by private munificence, it will never be accomplished at all. We may still be left to indulge our despondency, and weep over

the literary desolation of this fair field, where learning and religion, literature and the arts, might so easily find a common sanctuary.

Again ; it is obvious to the sagacious observer, that this country is to become the seat of war between Christianity and her foes, of every form and every degree of pretension. Already, in fact, it is so. And Christians must be prepared to maintain the external defence of our holy religion, by the same weapons by which she ever has been, and will be assailed by her enemies,—namely, those which are furnished by profound and extensive research.

We wish, however, to direct the attention of our fellow-citizens to arguments of a more specific character, and less generally appreciated, derived from the peculiar and unrivalled condition and prospects of our large commercial cities.

These cities, if we mistake not, are soon to be numbered among the greatest commercial emporia in the world. And what an assemblage of ideas crowd upon the mind in conjunction with this interesting supposition ! Who does not know that a great commercial city cannot, in the nature of things, be *exclusively* and *merely* a *commercial* city ? A demand for skill in the various collateral arts, a thirst for general information, a desire to gratify the innate sense of beauty in the decorations of our public and private edifices, public spirit, and an honest pride of character,—these are but a few of the concomitant circumstances that necessarily call forth indefinitely the energies of such a city, in every department of labor and enterprise, and direct them far beyond the confines of mere trade and commerce.

To the population, then, of our cities, their resources, their practical and ornamental arts, their intellectual and corporeal industry, their literary and scientific culture, who will dare to assign a limit ? What mind can comprehend, at one view, the restless activity, the increasing ferment, the continual flow of wealth, into these grand reservoirs and the countless streams that shall again flow forth, in some form or other, as a blessing or a curse, to every portion of our country and of the globe ?

To what, now, must we look, in conjunction with religion, to preserve us from the dominion of error and infidelity, to create and sustain a sense of our public dignity, to give efficiency and a laudable direction to our untiring enterprise, to raise us above mere animal existence to the character and aspirations of an in-

tellectual community, to keep alive a spirit of invention and discovery, and to feed the restless mind with its appropriate food? What, in a word, is to resist the inroads of ignorance, of vice, of error, of infidelity, of sensuality, of luxury—of that dark and dismal chaos of moral elements, that will bid defiance to social order, wholesome subordination, and the restraints of law? Must we not give immediate heed to the intellectual wants of our growing community? Must we not make our facilities for intellectual culture and literary excellence commensurate with our increasing mental activity and irrepressible energies? In a word, must we not, promptly and energetically, meet a want which has already, for years, been felt in our country of an adequate library of reference,—ample, easy of access, sufficiently extensive to meet the varied demands for information in every department of art, science, or literature?

That we do not exaggerate our actual and pressing wants, as regards the several departments of art, science, and literature, will be manifest from the following statements, which we venture to make after careful calculation.

In order to place the department of *Architecture* on such a footing, in a Library of reference, as to satisfy the generous aspirations of our students and professors in that department, and enable them to exert a benign influence on our cities and country, we could readily and advantageously dispose of the sum of \$30,000 in the purchase of works in that department alone . . . \$30,000

Of this any competent bibliographer or well informed architect, may satisfy himself, by enumerating the principal and costly publications which now enrich the libraries of Europe. Under present circumstances, the architectural student or professor must accumulate, at a vast individual expense, an architectural library, if he hope to meet with ordinary success; and the few whose means enable them to indulge in this luxury, must, from the nature of the case, indulge in it *alone*. The public cannot profit by the presence of these works, except in a very remote and scanty manner.

To place the increasingly popular department of *Civil Engineering*, with its cognate branches, on the same footing, we could advantageously expend the sum of . . . \$20,000
 For the *Fine Arts*, especially the remaining arts of Design (a very extensive department), . . . 50,000
 For *Chemistry*, especially in its connexion with the arts, . . . 10,000

For <i>Geology, Mineralogy, Metallurgy</i> and <i>Fossil</i> and <i>recent Conchology</i> ,	15,000
For <i>Botany</i> ,	15,000
For <i>Zoology</i> , including <i>Mammalogy, Ornithology, Ichthyology, Entomology</i> , and other branches (also a very expensive department),	50,000
For <i>History</i> , Civil and Ecclesiastical,	40,000
For <i>Mathematics</i> , pure and applied,	40,000
For <i>Natural Philosophy</i> , including <i>Astronomy</i> ,	30,000
For <i>Moral Science</i> , including <i>Ethics, Political Science, Natural Law</i> and <i>Political Economy</i> ,	50,000
For <i>Greek and Latin Classics</i> ,	40,000
For <i>Hebrew</i> and other branches of the Semitic stock,	10,000
For other <i>Oriental Languages</i> and literature including the Indo-Germanic stock,	10,000
For <i>Modern Languages</i> , including all the necessary helps,	40,000
For <i>Rhetoric, Criticism</i> and <i>Belles Lettres</i> ,	30,000

Amounting in all to \$500,000

If we add for books strictly professional, viz.

For <i>Law</i> ,	100,000
For <i>Theology</i> ,	100,000
For <i>Medicine</i> ,	100,000

We have in all \$800,000

Which would be immediately required, in order to place all these departments on even a respectable footing in a library of reference such as our country now demands.

If therefore we wish to see our country as eminent for its literary cultivation as it is for its enterprise in all the departments of business—if we wish to see mind exerting its influence on mind, by means of those associations for the promotion of science and literature, which are the chief ornaments of the cities of Europe,—we must provide a great library for the supply of their daily intellectual food, and to nourish and invigorate their energies. It is as impossible for such associations to exist, much less to prosper and exert their enlightening and meliorating influence, without the proximity of such a library, as for a community of workmen, employed on some mechanical labor, to cheer each other in their toil, and advance their appropriate work with a miserably contracted allowance of daily food. In each case weakness, lethargy, dulness, starvation, and death must ensue.

Again; if we would render our country a favorite resort for

literary and scientific men of other climes,—a circumstance which eminently contributes to humanize, refine, and dignify a community,—we must provide the necessary attraction—an ample library—a grand store house of knowledge, to which even the European scholar will feel it a privilege to resort.

Is it not, then, high time to commence *this* enterprise also, and to give it a commanding rank, among the enterprises for which our country has been so justly celebrated?

Permit us here to state a few facts, serving to show the vast inferiority of our country, as regards its provisions for the higher intellectual wants and literary culture of the community.

The public libraries of the United States, embracing those belonging to colleges, theological seminaries, city corporations, companies and societies are rated as follows:—*

<i>Colleges.</i>	<i>Coll. Librs.</i>	<i>Students Librs.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
Harvard University,	42,000	6,000	48,000
St. Mary's, Balt.	10,000		10,000
Georgetown, D. C.	10,000		10,000
Yale,	8,500	6,500	15,000
S. Carolina, Col.	8,000		8,000
Bowdoin,	8,000	4,000	12,000
Columbia, N. Y.	8,000		8,000
Virginia, U.	8,000		8,000
Allegheny, Meadville,	7,000		7,000
College of N. Jersey,	7,000	4,000	11,000
Mount St. Mary's, Md.	7,000		7,000
Brown U.	6,000	5,700	11,700
St. Mary's, Barrens, Mo.	6,000		6,000
Union,	5,500	8,000	13,500
Hampden Sydney,	5,000		5,000
St. Joseph's, Bardstown,	5,000		5,000
Dartmouth,	4,000	8,000	12,000
Amherst,	4,000	3,000	7,000
Columbian, D. C.	4,000	1,000	5,000
Williams,	3,000	1,500	4,500
Wesleyan U. Ct.	3,000		3,000
Rutgers,	3,500		3,500
William and Mary,	3,500		3,500
Charleston, S. C.	3,000		3,000
Georgia U.	3,000	1,500	4,500
Alabama U.	3,000		3,000

* [The statement in relation to some of the colleges is rather low. The total at Amherst is more than 10,000; at Williams more than 6,000. Ed.]

Greenville, Tenn.	3,500		3,500
St. Louis, U. Mo.	4,500		4,500
Waterville, Me.	2,000	,500	2,500
Middlebury, Vt.	2,000	2,500	4,500
Washington, Ct.	2,000	1,200	3,200
Hamilton,	2,500		2,500
U. of Penn.	2,000		2,000
Dickinson, Pa.	2,000		2,000
St. John's, Annapolis,	2,500		2,500
Nashville U.	2,000		2,000
Transylvania, Ky.	2,000		2,000
Augusta, Ky.	2,000	,500	2,500
Kenyon, Oh.	2,000		2,000
University of Vt.	1,500	1,000	2,500
Jefferson, Pa.	1,000		1,000
Washington, Pa.	1,500		1,500
Washington, Va.	1,500		1,500
N. Carolina U.	1,500		1,500
East Tennessee,	1,000		1,000
Centre Danville, Ky.	1,500		1,500
Georgetown, Ky.	1,000		1,000
Ohio U. Oh.	1,500	,500	2,000
Miami U. Oh.	1,000		1,000
Western Reserve,	1,500		1,500
Franklin, Oh.	1,000		1,000
Illinois Col.	1,000		1,000
Total,	<u>232,500</u>	<u>55,400</u>	<u>287,900</u>

We have enumerated fifty-two universities and colleges. The whole number in the United States is said to be about eighty. Assuming eighty as the number of the organized colleges in the United States, and allowing for the twenty-eight not enumerated, an average of 500 vols. for each, we have for these twenty-eight colleges the gross amount of 14,000 vols. If we allow also 15,000 vols. for the student's libraries of whose size we have no certain information, we shall then obtain the gross amount of volumes in all the colleges, including student's libraries in the United States, 316,900.

Of the fifty-two enumerated colleges six are under the

care of the Roman Catholics, with	42,500 vols.
Of the Baptists, four, with	20,200
Of the Episcopalians, five, with	18,700
Of the Methodists, four, with	14,500
Of the other denominations chiefly Congregationalists and Presbyterians the remaining thirty-three, with		192,000

Theological Seminaries.

Andover,	13,000
Gettysburgh,	7,000
Princeton,	6,000
Southern and Western Theol. Sem.	6,000
Western Theol. Sem.	4,000
Auburn,	4,500
Episcopal Sem. N. Y.	4,500
Union Theol. Sem.	3,000
Literary and Theol. Sem. Hamilton,	2,500
Theological Seminary, Alexandria,	2,000
Bangor,	2,000
Theological Inst. Newton,	1,800
Theol. Sem. Hartwick,	1,500
Southern Theol. Sem.	1,500
Lane Seminary,	8,000
<hr/>	
Total,	67,800

We have here enumerated the fifteen principal theological seminaries. There are said to be about thirty-five in all in the United States. Allowing for the twenty institutions not enumerated, (some of which have as yet no libraries, or none distinct from those of the seminaries with which they are connected), an average of 800 vols. each, which we cannot but regard as amply sufficient, we have for these twenty seminaries 16,000 vols. which gives for the thirty-five theological seminaries of the United States, the gross amount of 83,800 vols.

Other Public Libraries.

Philadelphia Library,	44,000
Boston Athenaeum,	29,000
New York Society Library,	25,000
Congress Library,	25,000
Charleston Society,	15,000
Boston Library,	10,000
Worcester Antiquarian Society,	12,000
Baltimore Library,	12,000
American Philosophical Society, Philad.	10,000
Boston Society,	9,000
New York Historical Society,	10,000
Philadelphia Athenaeum,	7,000
New York Mercantile,	11,000
New York Apprentices'	11,000
<hr/>	
Total,	230,000

These it is believed, are the principal public libraries of the United States, belonging to city corporations, literary societies, or to other associations, amounting to 230,000. About thirty additional libraries in various cities of the United States, might be named embracing each a small number of volumes. If we allow 1000 vols. to each of them (many of which will doubtless fall short of this number) we shall have 30,000 volumes to add to the above, making the amount of volumes, in all the public libraries of this description, 260,000.

Thus we have for the public libraries of the United States :

Belonging to Colleges	316,900
Theological Seminaries,	83,800
Other libraries,	260,000
Total,		660,700

These 660,700 vols. are found in about 200 libraries of colleges, college students, theological seminaries, etc., and if brought together, in order to form *one* library, would be reduced to about 550,000 vols. by rejecting all copies excepting one of works which would occur, some two hundred times ; some, one hundred and fifty times ; some, one hundred ; some, ninety ; some, eighty ; and some, fifty times ; and so on as we descended from the common popular works found in every library, down to those that are more rare and are met with only in a few. This reduction is necessary in order to institute a just comparison with *single* libraries of Europe.

The principal libraries of Europe that contain more than 100,000 volumes are the following :

Royal Library of Paris,	400,000 vols.
Central Library of Munich,	400,000
Vatican,	360,000
Imperial Library of St. Petersburg,	300,000
Imperial Library at Vienna,	300,000
University of Göttingen,	300,000
Bodleian Library at Oxford,	300,000
Royal Library, Copenhagen,	260,000
Royal Library, Dresden,	250,000
Ducal Library, Wolfenbüttel,	210,000
British Museum,	200,000
Royal Library, Berlin,	200,000
Royal Library, Madrid,	200,000
St. Mary's, Venice,	150,000
Bologna,	150,000

Magliabecchiana Library, Florence, . . .	150,000
Cambridge, England, . . .	140,000
Royal Library, Stuttgart, . . .	140,000
Academical Library, Prague, . . .	130,000
Naples, . . .	130,000
Ambrosian Library, Milan, . . .	120,000
Laurentian Library, Florence, . . .	120,000
Lyons, . . .	120,000
St. Genevieve, Paris, . . .	112,000
Ducal Library, Weimar, . . .	110,000
Ducal Library, Parma, . . .	110,000
St. Petersburg Academy of Science, . . .	110,000
Ghent, . . .	110,000
Grand Ducal, Darmstadt, . . .	110,000
Bordeaux, . . .	105,000
Total,	5,797,000

Whole number of volumes in thirty European libraries each containing more than 100,000 volumes, .	5,797,000
Number of volumes in all the public libraries of Ger- many, including the Austrian empire and Prussia, .	6,650,000
Number of volumes in all the public libraries of Paris, .	1,330,000
Number of volumes in all the public libraries of Lyons, .	600,000
Number of volumes in the public libraries of Marseilles, .	150,000

Public Libraries of the city of New York, viz.

New York Society, . . .	25,000
Mercantile, . . .	11,000
Apprentices, . . .	11,000
Columbia College, . . .	8,000
Historical Society, . . .	10,000
Episcopal Seminary, . . .	4,500
Total,	69,500

From the preceding exposition it appears, that the whole number of volumes contained in about two hundred public libraries of the United States (amounting to 660,700), barely exceeds, *numerically*, the number contained in the libraries of the city of Lyons. And, if reduced to *one* library, would not greatly exceed, in number of volumes, some of the first rate libraries of Europe.

Again; the whole number of volumes contained in all the public libraries of the United States, form but about the tenth part of the number contained in the public libraries of Germany, viz. 6,650,000; or about half the number contained in the pub-

lic libraries of Paris, viz. 1,330,000. In other words, the number of volumes belonging to the public libraries of the States of Germany amounts to 5,989,300 beyond the number to be found on the shelves of the public libraries of the whole United States. So also, the libraries of the city of Paris alone, embracing 1,330,000 volumes, exceed those of the whole United States by 669,300 volumes. And the city of Lyons alone can boast of nearly as many volumes in its public libraries, as would be furnished by all the public libraries of the twenty-six United States.

Again ; the public libraries of the city of New York collectively, amount to 69,500 volumes. If these 69,500 volumes were brought together, assorted and arranged, rejecting duplicates, etc. in order to form *one* library ; it would numerically not much exceed the single library of Harvard University.

Again ; it appears that all the public libraries of the city of New York, will furnish about *one ninth part* of the number of volumes embraced in the libraries of the city of Lyons ; with which, in point of population, and devotion to manufactures and commerce, a comparison may be instructively made ; and not *one half* as many volumes as are contained in the public libraries of Marseilles, an enterprising commercial city, with a population one half as great as that of New York.

If it be objected that the libraries of Europe have been accumulating centuries upon centuries, and thus have swollen to their present imposing size, we would remark, that the university of Göttingen dates its origin *a century* later than our own Harvard, and is now one of the first institutions of the age, with a library of 300,000 volumes ; while our venerable Harvard has not yet been able to rise above its 42,000. The university of Berlin was founded in 1809, and is now one of the most distinguished of the universities of Germany, with a library of 200,000 volumes. The library of the university of Bonn, *chartered in* 1818, already numbers 50,000 volumes, exceeding the number of volumes contained in the library of Harvard University, that has just witnessed its *second centennial celebration*.

We ask, then, again, Is it not high time to commence an enterprise not merely noble and ennobling in itself, but really essential to the future prosperity, happiness and respectability of our country ?

If there is a distinguishing trait of national character in the American people, it is *untiring energy*. There is here an elasticity of mind which, under the influence of our free institutions,

has both the opportunity and space to expand ; and under the pressure of adversity, the power which exists in no other country, and under no other system, to resist and overcome obstacles. Naturally connected with this is the conception of large plans for the future. Every plan must, of necessity, be conceived on a *grand* scale, or we fall below the standard of American character. When we consider the amount of mind in active exercise in the United States, at work for good or for evil, is it not manifest that the food of mind ought to be of a quality and quantity suited to the exigencies of the case ?

When the dearth of literary food in the country is considered ; —when the facts are stated which show how far it is behind some petty States, or even cities, of Europe, will the citizens of the United States be alarmed at a proposition to make their country the depository of the best library in the world ?

We should not feel ourselves to be worthy of the country in which we live, could we consent to offer a little or contracted scheme, for their approbation. Who can calculate the advantages to this country of such a library ? Who can estimate the effect on religion, literature, the sciences, the arts, on commerce, agriculture, manufactures, not of this country only, but of the whole world ?

Lest, however, a feeling of discouragement should possess our minds in view of the supposed amount of time necessary for the accumulation of such a library, as is here contemplated, judging, as we are prone to do, by the more tardy operations of our transatlantic brethren, we are reminded forcibly of a fact, which needs only to be mentioned in order to rouse our energies, and encourage a well grounded confidence of success. We allude to the circumstance that every enterprise, of whatever character, though pregnant with difficulties, and apparently impracticable, has, when undertaken with the genuine American hardiness, and pertinacity, been brought to its accomplishment with a rapidity, which, though nothing but the natural development of vigorous faculties, under propitious circumstances, excites the amazement of every foreigner, who visits our favored shores. Two years since, the devouring element swept over acres of the crowded city of New York, and now a vestige scarce remains of its awful ravages. The foreigner, on his arrival asks to see the *ruins* of the great conflagration ; but they "*are not.*" The animated hum of business alone is heard, and, in a few more months, the event itself will appear like a vague dream, or a remote tradition.

It must, therefore, be acknowledged that another distinguishing trait of American character, is the unrivalled promptness and rapidity with which even the largest plans are carried forward to their accomplishment. The interval between the conception and the execution, usually filled up with doubts, and fears, trials and failures, hopes and anxieties, is here almost annihilated by the absorbing energy with which we press forward to the consummation.

Finally : Is there a spot on the surface of the globe whose geographical position, whose facilities for intercourse with every clime, whose easy, rapid, and comparatively cheap acquisition of every foreign valuable article it seeks to attain, in a word whose physical, commercial and political advantages call so loudly and impressively upon its citizens, to make it the envied depôt not merely of every description of merchandise, but also of literature, of learning, of science, of the arts, and of their inseparable and indispensable co-adjutor—an ample library ?

ARTICLE IX.

DESIGN OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.*

By the Rev. L. P. Hickok, Professor of Didactic Theology, in the Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio.

THE great object before the church is the subjection of the world to Jesus Christ. The chief instrument divinely appointed for this end is the holy ministry. God has given to it the high commission to “disciple all nations,” and each minister in his own station is, as far as possible, to promote this object. The obligation thus resting alike upon all, secures in the aggregate the accomplishment of the ultimate end, in proportion to their number and extension. No single station has a right to urge its claims in competition with the interests of the whole. If, in the enlightened observation of christian wisdom, the ultimate design can be best promoted by the transfer of one man to another station, this, and not the separate interest of any place, must bind the conscience and control the conduct.

* This article was delivered by the author as an inaugural address.—ED.

"The field is the world," and the injunction to "pray the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth laborers into his harvest" has reference to the whole field, and not to any exclusively favored portion of it. The design of the christian ministry is the conversion of the *whole world* to Christ.

The design of Theological Seminaries is to provide the most efficient ministry for this purpose. The world is to be kept in view, and a ministry best adapted to its entire subjection to God is to be provided. I assume this proposition therefore as true—**THE GREAT DESIGN OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES IS TO FURNISH THE MOST EFFICIENT MINISTRY FOR THE WORLD.**

The present purpose is to give an attention to the inquiry—how shall this great design be attained? The answer will be given under a few *general heads*, and the whole subject followed through several particular *deductions*.

To provide the most efficient ministry for the world, theological seminaries must labor

I. *To extend and perfect theological science.*

No new revelation is to be expected from heaven. Nor are we to expect that any new fundamental principles will be discovered, in the revelation which has already been given. The sanctified minds of eighteen centuries have been devoutly directed to the Bible, and it cannot be that any doctrines or duties essential to salvation, remain yet hidden beyond the reach of their researches. Such a supposition would be an impeachment of the wisdom and sincerity of its divine author. The great doctrines which compose the system of **SUBSTANTIAL CHRISTIANITY** can never be greatly modified by any subsequent investigation. These compose "the foundation of God," which "*standeth sure.*"

But theology as a science is far more comprehensive. It includes not only the truths necessary to salvation, but many important and influential doctrines in addition. Every theological system must contain much besides its fundamental principles. Collateral doctrines and legitimate deductions, philosophical explanations and practical results must all belong to the system, and all be harmoniously combined and amply demonstrated. In its perfect state the system must be inclusive of all truth which belongs to theology. What has already been discovered must be put in its proper place, and there must also be space enough for the harmonious addition of all new truth which shall be discovered in time and eternity. The right system must be

competent to embrace all truth, and put all truth in its right place.

It is therefore clear that there is great room for improvement in theological science. Not only is there more truth to be discovered and systematized, but the definite shape and outline of the system which shall include what has already been found, is far from being satisfactorily settled. Two great general systems, the Calvinistic and Arminian, hold their place in the religious world, and with their various modifications divide the sincere and devout disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ. Both include the truths of substantial Christianity, and therefore in the great essentials of salvation the sincere members of each have but "one Lord, one faith and one baptism." But beyond these foundation doctrines of a common salvation, they each have a system of important truths which are widely different from each other. They involve different philosophical explanations, and compel to the different interpretation of the same texts of Scripture. Though they are each harmonious with their own parts, yet are they so different from each other, that both cannot be true; and yet both, as to general system, are so comprehensive that one of them must be true. In this one fact there is enough to convince us that theological science is yet far from its utmost attainable perfection. Who shall say that it is a hopeless effort to find which of these is the true system? And who believes that this may not be so enlightened and fortified by Scripture and reason, that in proportion as prejudice and party die, and an honest love of truth prevails, the whole of Christ's "disciples indeed" shall be brought intelligently and cordially to embrace it? It is promised that such "shall know the truth, and the truth shall make them free." There might still to different minds, be different modifications and explanations of particular portions, but it would be substantially the same general system. This can be done. Diligent and serious research will find truth enough to establish and confirm the right system, and send the false one to the oblivion which now covers the exploded planetary theories of Ptolemy or Tycho Brahe. *

* The words of the pious and learned John Robinson, who was the pastor of the English church in Holland which sent the first colony to the rock of Plymouth, and spread over this land the faith of the puritans, are here highly appropriate. As the sails of the Mayflower which was to bear them across the ocean were spread to the

All science is subsidiary to theology. And at the present day the votaries of science are pushing forward with ardor and success in all the departments of human knowledge. The present is a most auspicious time to advance theological science. Many things conspire to elucidate the Bible. Pure truth yet lies hidden in the exhaustless mine of revelation, and facilities for bringing it forth to light multiply around us. Mental science is improved, and the laws of the human mind are better understood. The philosophy of language, and principles of interpretation—the manners and customs, geography and natural history of the nations of the Bible, are better known. The discovery and examination of ancient monuments, cities and sepulchres, with all their inscriptions, sculptures and hieroglyphics—the more attentive study of dogmatic history bringing out and comparing former religious opinions—and especially the application of the truth and its results by missionary efforts, in the case of great numbers and wide varieties of the heathen—are all pouring their converging rays upon the sacred record, and throwing a light upon every page, unknown since the Holy Spirit inspired holy men of old to write it.

Theological Seminaries are required to avail themselves of all these advantages for better understanding the Bible, and

winds, he says — “Brethren, we now quickly part. — Whether I see your faces on earth again the God of heaven only knows. Follow me no further than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ. If God reveal any thing to you by any other instrument of his, be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry : for I am verily persuaded, I am confident the Lord hath more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word. For my part I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the reformed churches, who are come to a *period* in religion ; and will go at present no further than the instruments of their first reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther said : whatever part of his will our good God has imparted and revealed unto Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it ; and the Calvinists you see stick fast where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not *all* things. This is a misery much to be lamented, for though they were burning and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God, but were they now living they would be as willing to embrace further light, as that which they at first received. Remember it—it is an article of your church covenant—“*Be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known unto you from the written word of God.*” Mather’s *Magnalia*, Vol. I. pp. 59, 60.

apply the whole diligently to the extension of theological science. It is essential to the training of the most efficient ministry for the world. An improved philosophy is subjecting the world of matter to man ; and a clearer and more comprehensive knowledge of the system of divine truth is also to bring the heart and conscience under the power of the preacher. Any fact, however minute, which places one text of Scripture in a clearer light, is invaluable to the world. No finite mind can predict its ultimate results. It is by this increased knowledge of divine truth, that the church of God in the latter day can afford to dispense with all the "mighty signs and wonders" of the primitive age.

II. *To secure a thorough and specific mental discipline.*

An academical course of study is designed for the general development of all the faculties. The process of discipline in all colleges should be adapted to call forth the energies of the whole mind. Nor is there at present any probability that a more efficacious course will be found, than the long tried and approved system of thorough classical and mathematical training. But when the mind is brought under the influence of the theological seminary, though it should be allowed to relax none of its energies, yet henceforth its training is no longer to be *general* but *specific*. The object now is not merely a strong mind, but an able minister—not generally, the capacity to *strike hard*, but specifically, to know *what* to strike, and *how* to hit. It is the want of this specific discipline, which leaves too many to spend their lives in doing little else than "beating the air."

There must therefore be a course of discipline pursued with specific reference to the peculiar object. It is a standing law of dynamics, that all moving forces must be applied in the direct line of their natural tendencies. You can accomplish nothing by working against nature. The water-wheel may be mechanically perfect, but it will not move against the stream—the machine will never reverse the direction of the power which propels it. No skill of the mechanic can accomplish any thing, in violation of this law of nature. Indeed all skill is found in the most exact observance of it. But the laws of mind are as constant as the laws of matter, and all successful action upon mind must accord with them. Divine truth has its own nature—that which gives to it its specific identity—and mind has its own nature ; and nothing will be gained by applying the one to the other contrary to nature. God's Spirit does not subvert

his own laws in either the mind or the truth, when he renews and sanctifies the mind through the truth. Man is no further a successful instrument, or an effectual co-worker with God in the salvation of sinners, than he exerts his agency in conformity with these unchanging laws. No power of intellect or fertility of genius can avail any thing in opposition. He must know the nature of the material on which he works, and of the instrument by which he works, and thus select with wisdom and apply with skill, or he will "labor in vain and spend his strength for nought."

It has been assumed, that the best way of gaining this practical wisdom in the ministry is by a process of instruction under the direction of some wise and experienced pastor. The success of such men as Hooker, Porter and others, has been adduced in confirmation. But while it is admitted that there must be wisdom and experience in all the departments of theological instruction, and that on this account it will be found a matter of constant necessity, to supply theological seminaries to a great extent from the pastors of the churches, yet there are many considerations which go to prove, that the seminary, and not the study of the private pastor, is the place to provide the most efficient ministry for the world.

Few such men as those above referred to can be found; and if they were far more common in the churches, the vast accumulation of ministerial labors upon settled pastors at the present day would utterly forbid their assuming this additional burden. The number of young men now preparing for the sacred office, and the prospective demand of the world for many more, destroy all rational hope of supply from such a source. Besides, the seminary is the *best* place for ministerial training. A broader system is pursued and more helps are at hand — the stimulus of numbers is felt, and opportunities of discussion and friendly mental collision are afforded — and in the surrounding region, especially among the new churches of the West, the calls for biblical, catechetical, and Sabbath school instruction, and all the facilities for social exhortation and prayer, and every practical preparation for the ministry are far more abundant than any single pastor's time, or library or parish can afford. It is the design to accumulate these facilities for thorough and specific discipline in theological seminaries, that they may apply them to the great purpose of providing for the world, the most efficient ministry which can be made out of fallen men.

III. To cultivate a spirit of warm, devotional piety.

Talent, learning, eloquence, orthodoxy, can never be made substitutes for piety. If the minister is not a holy man, all other attainments are but so much power for evil. And if he is really a converted man, while his piety is greatly alloyed by sloth and idleness on the one hand, or rashness and blind zeal on the other, he had better betake himself to any other calling than the sacred ministry. The man who ministers from God to dying men must be deeply imbued with the spirit of Jesus Christ. There must be habitual communion with God, a strong love for souls, for the closet, for the Bible. This world of sensuality and infidelity and idolatry is not to be brought back in allegiance to God without a ministry whose piety is deep, decided and ardent. Their lives as well as their lips must preach the gospel.

There is danger, that in acquiring other qualifications, this essential one should be too much neglected. The awakened energy of mind and ardor of investigation may restrain the affections of the heart, and wither the christian graces. Every seminary is bound to watch and pray against consequences so destructive, and exert a direct influence upon the precious youth within its walls to keep them near to God and ripe for heaven. Piety will not advance without exercise. The heart as well as the intellect must be cultivated. No matter with what firmness of sinew and fulness of muscle the dry bones may be clothed, if the warmth and vigor of the vital spirits are not there, it is a lifeless organization — mere dead matter — fit only for the sepulchre. A ministry for the church of God and the world of sinners must glow with spiritual life and strength, or it is good for nothing for either.

But besides this general method of answering the question — how shall theological seminaries secure their object? — there is an opportunity for a more particular consideration, by following out some *deductions* from the main principle.

If it is the object of theological seminaries to furnish the most efficient ministry for the world, then—

1. They must be allowed the free investigation of the Bible.

Free inquiry is the natural right of the human mind. There is no general principle within the range of human thought, which the mind may not examine freely and fearlessly. The Bible is as open to investigation as the book of nature. There is a sacredness and solemnity in all truth wherever found, and

especially in the truths of revelation ; but there is nothing there too sacred or too awful for human examination. A reverent and humble spirit may fix its gaze on the holiest mystery which the Spirit of God has put upon the sacred pages. Let the man "put his shoes from off his feet," and he may stand erect before the burning bush while the great "I AM" declares his awful message.

Yea it is not only the *right*, but the *duty* of the human mind to examine the Bible. God has bid us "search the Scriptures," and the obligation applies to all which the Scriptures contain. Especially is this the duty of theological seminaries. Minds are there trained who are to be "set for the defence of the Gospel," and they cannot defend it, if they do not understand it. Mere authority in this age is good for nothing. Ecclesiastical decisions can carry with them no force, any further than they embody truth. No article of any creed can stand any further than it will bear the most rigid examination. Nothing which belongs to religion is to be kept in darkness, or attempted to be sustained but by the power of truth. The opinions of the fathers, the writings of the wise and good of former days should be diligently consulted and carefully pondered. It is but the arrogance of ignorance and folly which affects to despise them as out of date and behind the age. But they are to be regarded as teachers, not tyrants. It is the truth which they contain, and not their age merely, which makes them venerable. Whatever there may be in them which will not bear examination, is as worthless and as determinately to be rejected as the errors of yesterday.

The ministry of the present age is called to meet every form of specious delusion and sophistry and cavilling skepticism. The votaries of sensuality and the worshippers of mammon have a thousand deceitful hiding places. The heathen nations have their long-used superstitions, and in many cases the most subtle and elaborate systems of error ; while the Roman beast and the false prophet have been deluding the nations for ages, and bound the human mind with fetters of iron. The men who are to meet all this hostile array and subdue or annihilate it, must not only be permitted, but trained to examine every thing that belongs to it. Not only the substantial doctrines of religion and their common arguments of defence, but the whole system of theology must be understood, with its modern objections and evasions and perversions, and all that philosophy or

reason or the Bible can bring to bear upon it. This is no time to shrink from the collision of mind with mind — of *christian* mind with *pagan* mind — or *infidel* mind. The contest is already begun ; the conflict is even now desperate ; neither the friend nor the enemy of the Bible can draw back from the shock of conflicting opinions and purposes. One or the other must fall vanquished on the field, and yield the kingdom to the conqueror. Let the Bible and reason have full scope — let truth unshackled grapple with error — and it is not doubtful which shall be victorious. Depraved and rebellious as man is, there is that in Divine truth, applied by God's Spirit, which reaches his conscience and subdues his stubborn will.

Theological seminaries are designed to raise up a ministry adequate to the exigencies of such a crisis ; they must therefore be permitted to survey the whole field and every thing pertaining to it. They should possess such a love to truth, and such an honest mind in seeking it, that they can have no rest in taking things upon trust, or covering ignorance by sophistry. To such a mind all truth is free, and all but truth is worthless. The attempt to chain it by authority, or frighten it by pretensions of sacred awe and mystery, from looking or thinking upon any truth of God, is high treason against the Bible under the name of loyalty. You may as well say that there are some substances too sacred for the chemist to analyze, or some portions of the heavens too holy for the astronomer to bring under the range of his telescope, as that there are some portions of the Bible too solemn and mysterious for the christian minister to examine. There are many things both in nature and revelation which man will not comprehend in this life, but in this fact there is found no prohibition to push his researches to the utmost limits, nor by devout efforts to move that limit, if he can, much further onward into the unexplored darkness, and reclaim the region to the clear possession of human science. God has set them both before us, and when we will, we may examine them. Those especially, who are set to prepare the Lord's ambassadors, *must* examine, humbly, reverently, seriously, but freely and unhesitatingly, everything that is connected with the sacred office. *They* must emphatically — “ prove all things and hold fast that which is good.”

2. *They must not foster a sectarian spirit.*

Different views of important doctrines, ceremonies, or modes of government may give rise to separate organizations, with

their different *names*, and thus perpetuate in the church different *denominations*. No attempt in the present day to merge them all in one is likely to prove either successful or salutary. Even theological seminaries must be more or less denominational in their sympathies and patronage.

But denominational peculiarities may become too prominent. Notwithstanding an agreement in all that is involved in substantial Christianity, they may be magnified to matters of such moment as to bar the way to christian communion and coöperation. It then goes beyond a separate organization, having a common purpose though a different name, and becomes a *sect*—a party *cut off* by its own exclusiveness, from the common sympathies and fellowship of the general family of Christ. *Denominational* distinctions are therefore expedients, and will be perpetual, so long as there is a disagreement in important principles. But *sectarianism* can never be justified by any differences, while there is a union on the substantial doctrines which are essential to salvation.

The ministry, from the very nature of their relation to the church, must exert a controlling influence on this subject. If they are divided into parties the whole church will in like manner be broken up into fragments. Oh! how does infidelity strengthen itself, and vice and irreligion abound, and all the woes and cruelties of heathenism press upon the millions of its victims, while the church and the ministry are frivolously contending about mere sectarian distinctions. Those “schools of the prophets,” where the minds of the future pastors of the church are to be moulded, stand under fearful responsibilities to the great Head of the church on this particular point. They may explain and defend their denominational distinctions, but if the spirit of sectarianism be there, it will diffuse the poison through all the body. Their young men will go forth, with no zeal but for their distinctive peculiarities, to distract the church and disquiet the world with their bigoted notions, arrogant claims and conflicting measures.

There may be differences of philosophical speculation, and peculiarities in benevolent operations, and varieties of method and form, which shall give to different seminaries their distinctive characteristics. In this there is no ground of anxiety nor complaint. But when any of these peculiarities are thrust forward as matters of paramount importance, and made the strong points of appeal to either popular favor or popular odium, it be-

comes no longer honorable nor innocent. It is sectarianism in its degraded form, doing its hateful work and exposing its selfish spirit. The next downward step is to the use of all the catch-words and cant-phrases which are meant to mark the party and delude the multitude.

That high and holy effort, which seeks to furnish the most efficient ministry for the world, can have no fellowship with such unworthy expedients. Neither does the church nor the world need any more new theological seminaries, whose foundations are laid in popular prejudices, amid sectarian collisions, clamoring for their share of the charities of the church on the sole ground of their party organization. And that policy, which seeks to build itself upon such local and factitious excitements, is not only worldly and wicked, but miserably short sighted. The flowing tide will soon ebb, and leave them standing high and dry upon the beach.

3. *They must not interfere in ecclesiastical government.*

The professors in theological seminaries have as men all the civil and social, and as ministers all the ecclesiastical rights and privileges which others have. In proportion to their wisdom and piety, their counsel and influence are valuable, in all these relations. But as professors of theology their sole business is the instruction and discipline of the precious sons of the church under their care, to make them ministers such as the world needs. Their connection with a theological seminary adds no prerogatives to any other relation which they may sustain. As such, neither singly nor combined have they any thing to do with the legislative or judicial affairs of the church. They are not set as judges in Israel, nor as watchmen upon the walls of Zion. The keys are not in their hands,—they have no power to bind or loose. It is not for them to hunt out heresy, nor arraign or expel it from the church of God. She has her own organizations for that purpose, and they are bound both to the church and to Jesus Christ to be prompt and faithful. But in these matters, theological seminaries have no right to interfere. It is a direct violation of the apostolic injunction—"Let none of you suffer as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a busy body in other men's matters."

The danger may not be very great, that theological seminaries shall publicly seize the sceptre and rod of discipline and wield them directly over the ministry and membership of the churches. But there are many ways of stepping quite beyond

their sphere in these matters. They have facilities for a wide spread influence upon other minds. By correspondence, and personal interviews, and occasional meetings, rumors may be spread and prejudices excited and combinations formed against an obnoxious man or measure or party, which may as effectually shape results and secure a desired issue as if they were upon the judgment seat. Yea, when regular ecclesiastical trials have issued contrary to their wishes, they may put all these means in requisition to gain their sinister purposes in spite of constitutional rules and christian order.

This is a direct usurpation of the authority of God's house, and involves the very essence of spiritual tyranny. No member of a theological seminary can use in this way the facilities of his station for purposes of ecclesiastical discipline, with righteousness or decency. He was not put in that station for that purpose. He is meddling with what belongs to others. He is perverting that which was given to him for another object, and committing an offence against the order and peace of the church, for which there can be no other justification, than that "the end sanctifies the means."

4. *They must stand responsible to the enlightened sentiment of the christian church.*

There are various sources of supervision to which theological seminaries may be made responsible. It may be directly to the civil power—to a church judicatory—to a self-constituted association—or to enlightened christian sentiment. Instances, in this country and in Europe, may be found in all these varieties; and it is an open question—which is the best adapted to their great design?

Few probably in this country will be found in favor of direct responsibility to the *State*. This may be tolerated in Germany and the different monarchical governments of Europe, but can hardly consist with the genius of a free republic. Changing politics and shifting majorities must cause such a perpetual interference in its plans and operations, as effectually to break down its stability and power of doing good to the world.

Where the responsibility is to *ecclesiastical authority*, the danger is much the same both in kind and degree. If sectarianism did not control, and there were few liabilities to the fluctuations of party majorities, the evils would in proportion be few and small. But when contentions and divisions occur, scarcely less violent than in political parties, the institution itself must be

agitated by the storms and tempests which are about it. Every movement of the elements on which it rests is felt, and the unity of its design, and the efficiency of its efforts must be disturbed. This cannot be the best position for any institution, which is to regard the general good and labor for the whole world.

To be amenable to a *self-constituted body*, itself a sect—selecting its members on avowedly sectarian principles, and fencing itself round with sectarian regulations, can eventuate in nothing else but a sectarian theological seminary.

But where as ministers, all are responsible to their own ecclesiastical organizations, and as professors, are held amenable to a board of trust, which has its civil charter, giving plenary powers of administration and perpetuation of their own body, and then both its boards of trust and instruction amenable to the enlightened public sentiment of the christian community, we have all the security and effectual guardianship that can be attained, without the dangers of sectarian influences and party collisions. But it is the *intelligent christian* public to which it must be held responsible. The *christian* public are alone interested, and the *enlightened* portion of it alone competent, to decide in regard to its merits. In this way we have the same security that we have for any free institution in the land. It can prosper no further than they approve, nor become heretical, any further than they shall become the abettors of heresy. If the wise and the good are satisfied with it, they give it their patronage and their prayers; if they are dissatisfied, they withdraw their influence and their support, and the institution dies.

That institution has the surest guarantee for its permanent usefulness, which is entrenched in the judgment and affections of the most intelligent, stable, and pious in the land.

5. *Ecclesiastical bodies must not grant licenses but at the completion of a full course of study.*

The proper judicatories of the church are alone competent to regulate this matter. Theological seminaries can do no more than give their opinion and counsel. This however is plain, that, without a mutual understanding and coöperation on this subject, it were far better to dispense with theological seminaries altogether. They must be comparatively useless, and the expense of their endowments thrown away, if the youth under their training be hurried into the ministry after a few months' attention to the preparatory studies. If this is all that is requisite to fit a young man for the most responsible of all stations, then let not the

church be burdened with the unnecessary charge, nor mocked with the expectation, that better education will make any better ministry.

This is not the place to dwell upon the fallacy of such opinions, nor to show that piety, though essential to the ministry, must nevertheless be accompanied with an enlightened and enlarged understanding to fit them for their great design in converting the world. Nothing can more effectually cut every sinew of her strength, and leave the church weak and defenceless to every assailant, than the hasty admission of her sons to the sacred ministrations at the altar. They must be *able* to teach, and *apt* to teach, or they can only be "the blind leaders of the blind." And there is no patent process by which you can work this aptitude into mind, without its own exertion. There is no charm about any institution, or any boasted method of quicker and better preparation, that is about to make men "wise to win souls," without taxing their own energies, and obliging them to *think* deep and *study* long and intensely. There have been many such experiments, but they all fail, just as common sense would have predicted, because they go against nature. It is time the church had learned enough from her own sad experience, to be never deluded again by such miserable pretensions. Until the young man is well prepared for the sacred office it is no help to the church to induct him into it. By no means is it so much the *number*, notwithstanding all her waste places, as the *qualifications* of her ministers, about which the church ought to be deeply solicitous. Much is gained, in the case of every hasty young man, who is kept for a year out of the pulpit and at his proper studies. He is thus prepared to do something henceforth to the purpose, and the church is saved from the withering influence of a whole year's crude ministrations and rash measures. A full course should be insisted on, and no exceptions should ever be tolerated which would weaken the general rule. Intended kindness to the individual is treachery to the cause of religion.

6. *The number of theological seminaries may safely be left to the results of fair competition.*

The present tendencies doubtless are to an inordinate multiplication of them. The claims of the world and the efforts of the church to meet them would of themselves augment the number, and then there comes in all the additional incentives from local interests, sectarian zeal, and party prejudices. Dread

responsibilities rest upon those who engage in the establishment of new institutions. Much time and labor, money and talent must be expended upon every such object, and if it was not needed the whole has been perverted, and the prime movers stand responsible to heaven for it.

But to God alone must this responsibility be left. It is not for man to arraign and try their motives and estimate their guilt. The church has only to determine her own wants in this particular, and this it will do. Those institutions which are needed will be sustained, and all which are found useless will of course fall. No local interests or factitious excitements can long avail to keep in existence that which is not needed. A discerning public will eventually determine which ought to live and which ought to die. And while the individual responsibility is to God, the decision of life or death to the institution is in the intelligence of the church to determine which and what are fulfilling the great designs of God. The end in view is an efficient ministry for the world—not for a sect—not for a local object—not as the fruits of a transient excitement—but *for* a world, and *until* a world is brought back to God's allegiance. The seminary must therefore lay its foundations broad and deep, and its plans wide and extensive, looking not at the interests of a year or an age, but onwards till the millennium. Results permanent as truth, broad as Adam's dying race are to be gained, and that institution, which looks with a steady eye and holy aim to these enduring interests, will find its sure support in the permanency of the principles which it has consulted. The timid and the time-serving may come and go, applaud and revile, but the enlightened and the wise will give to it their confidence, their patronage and their prayers. Tremendous as the responsibility is, upon those who engage in the new enterprise, if their honest aim is the good of the world and the glory of God, and their measures are wise to win the end, the issue has nothing for them to fear. Their work will stand and prosper, while a thousand splendid projects and gilded bubbles burst around them. The event may be safely left to the decision of the Lord and his people.

7. *They must be the subjects of the unceasing prayers of the church.*

God, and not man, will have the glory of the world's subjection to Jesus Christ. It is to be effected "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." Nothing can be

more certain, than that God will blast all the undevout projects and expectations of his professing children. Especially upon theological seminaries must there be a constant descent of the dew of heaven. The board of supervision—of instruction—the youth who are instructed—all must feel the moving influence of the Holy Spirit, or no good will result to Zion. And this influence is given “*to those who ask him.*” And while those connected with the seminary should “*pray without ceasing,*” it is the special duty of the church to remember these “*schools of the prophets*” daily. They are not to be expected to prosper, unless *your* prayers abound. They are *your* instruments for the world’s conversion—your instruments to *teach* and to *train up* a pious and efficient ministry for the world, not to do your work of *prayer* and *supplication*. God’s blessing will not then be added without *your* prayers. Better forget almost any other instrumentality in your visits to the throne of grace, than your sources of theological instruction. Here are some of your most precious jewels; the hope of the world; the whole dependence under God for filling up your foreign and domestic fields of labor. A desertion here, a withdrawal of divine influence from these points, sends the surest, deadliest blight over all the prospects of Zion. Who can doubt that the numbers, and piety, and success of the ministry, must be proportioned to the prayers which God hears for this end? If you would have the world converted to God, brethren, you must pray much and fervently for the ministry, by whose labors and self-denial the work is chiefly to be accomplished. You must pray much and fervently also for those institutions, whose great design is to furnish this efficient ministry for the world’s redemption.

I close, by giving the assurance that this theological seminary shall be faithfully devoted to the great design, which we have been considering—a *faithful ministry for the world*. The course of instruction will be liberal, full and thorough. The system of theology as here explained and defended will be the Calvinistic, in the general form in which it appears in the works of Edwards, Bellamy, Dwight, etc. New England theology will be the standard of our orthodoxy—the system of faith which we cordially believe has the Bible for its basis. But we do not feel at liberty to call any man, master, in the sense of authority over our faith. We shall examine the opinions of the men we most favor, with as much freedom as those who

differ the widest from us. We shall state, illustrate and defend our opinions in our own way, and make our own devout examination of truth the measure of our instructions.

And while this will be the course of instruction, we will allow the same freedom to the youth under our care. We will urge them to make their own enlightened and honest convictions the guide of their faith and practice. While we avow the principles of our faith and the grounds of our orthodoxy, we abjure all sectarianism and will leave others to the free and honest expression of their own sentiments. We pledge our health and strength—our time and talents—our influence and example to the undivided object for which this seminary is founded—the training up an efficient ministry for the world. We expect the confidence and support of the pious—we pray for the approbation and blessing of heaven.

ARTICLE X.

ON THE INFREQUENCY OF THE ALLUSIONS TO CHRISTIANITY IN GREEK AND ROMAN WRITERS.

Translated from the Latin of H. T. Tschirner. By Horatio B. Hackett, Professor of Languages, Brown University.

THAT the Greek and Roman writers, who were contemporary with the apostles, have left nothing on record either in regard to the birth and actions of our Lord, or the early origin of the christian church, can excite the surprise of no one. For the Greeks and Romans were not accustomed to visit Jerusalem in the manner, that they were in the habit of resorting, the former to Rome, and the latter, to Athens. Very few, except soldiers, magistrates and merchants travelled to Palestine, which was situated on the remotest borders of the empire, and destitute of all those objects, which would be likely to attract either the votaries of science, or men of pleasure. As to the information concerning Jesus Christ, which it is probable, that Pontius Pilate, by whose authority the Saviour was put to death, transmitted to Tiberius, the number of those, who received it, was but small, and even they did not regard it as in any way

remarkable, or worthy of very particular notice.* The Greeks and Romans despised the Jews as a superstitious and illiterate people, and for this reason they neither read their sacred books, with whose very language in fact they were unacquainted, nor felt any great curiosity in regard to what took place among them. It is not strange, therefore, that the Greek and Roman writers, who were contemporary with the apostles, were either ignorant of the christian sect or silent concerning them.

But how is it to be explained, that even those authors, who wrote in the reign of Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian and the Antonines, so very seldom refer to the Christians, although spread, as they then were, throughout all parts of the Roman world? Were the christian churches, during a whole century (for Domitian obtained the sovereignty in the year 81 and Marcus Aurelius died in the year 180) so buried in a corner, that they were altogether unknown? Might we not have expected, that the eyes of mankind would have been turned towards those, who were sometimes the objects of punishment by the magistrates and who still oftener suffered from the violence of the multitude, who were enraged against them for despising their gods? Were those, who make no mention of the Christians, ignorant of them? or what reasons in short had they for their silence? It is not without cause surely, that such inquiries are made; and since they have recently been brought forward anew, and have been pronounced worthy of a more critical investigation, than they have yet received, by a man, to whose opinions we are accustomed to listen with respect, we deem it proper to give the subject a brief discussion, especially as it is not altogether foreign to a department of study, in which we are particularly interested.†

* The writings, which are known at the present day under the name of Acts of Pilate, are certainly not genuine: nor can any one easily believe, that Pilate wrote to the emperor those things, which Tertullian pretends were written by him. But that Pilate made a report to Tiberius in reference to the case of Jesus Christ, is very credible: since it belonged to the procurators to do this on occasions of the like nature. Cfr. *Henkii De Pontii Pilati Actis in causa Jesu Christi ad Imp. Tiberium missis Probabilia*, in ejusd. *Opusc. Acad.* p. 199 sqq.

† This man is the learned *Eichstaedt*, who in his essay on the question, whether Lucian intended by his writings to advance the christian cause, says, that he cherishes the hope that this subject may yet be more fully investigated. Jena, 1822. p. 29.

The question, however, which we propose to answer, has reference only to those Greek and Roman writers, who flourished from the time of Domitian to the end of the age of the Antonines. For from this time the Christians, having come forth, as it were, from the shade into the public light, and the view of men, found henceforth both advocates and not a few opponents of their cause; and in the third century the most distinguished of the Neo-Platonists, who were almost alone in their cultivation of philosophy and Greek letters, not only mentioned them, but also assailed their opinions and principles. On the contrary those, who wrote in the reigns of Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian and the Antonines, alluded to the Christians but seldom; for the most part they take no notice of them whatever; in a few instances they speak of them briefly, and, as it were, incidentally; and in still fewer cases, enter into argument against them.*

Among the Greeks, Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Oenomaus, who in the time of Hadrian anticipated the part of Lucian as a derider of the gods Maximus Tyrius and Pausanias, are entirely silent in respect to the Christians. In Plutarch, it is true, some have imagined, that they found an allusion to them in that passage of the *Symposion*, where reference is made to certain philosophers, who on account of their teaching, *συνεκτικωτατον ειναι του βιου το ελπιζειν* (that hope is the great supporter of life) and, *αλουσης ελπιδος ουδ' ηδυνουσης ουκ ανεκτον ειναι τον βιον* (that life, unless there be hope to sweeten it is too wretched to be endured), were called *ελπιστικοι*. But since there is nothing in this place to lead us to suppose, that it is a hope of heaven, such as the Christians cherished, which is here intend-

* It seems however by no means improbable, that they may have been mentioned in some one or other of those works of antiquity, which are no longer extant. Nor should we particularly object to it, if any one is disposed to think that the hands of superstitious men may have erased or omitted in the ancient manuscripts all those passages, which contained reproachful allusions to the Christians. That this was sometimes done may be inferred with some appearance of probability from the fact, that the dialogue of Lucian on the death of Peregrinus, in which the Christians are violently assailed, is wanting in a great many copies: and in one of the Royal manuscripts, there occurs an omission with the remark: *εταυθα παρειδη έχοντα οπιρ εστι Περσγρινου τελευτης λογον, δια το εν του τω αποσκαπτειν εις τον χριστιανισμον*. See the note in Opp. Luciani ed. Reitz. tom. III. p. 325.

ed, and since the Christians, who lived in the time of Plutarch, neither called themselves philosophers, nor were so called by others, it is utterly incredible, that this term, *Elpistics*, should contain a tacit allusion to them.* Thus Plutarch, like the author just mentioned, says nothing in relation to the Christians. This silence now appears the more singular, because he was a man, who took an interest in all which is human, who watched with the most careful eye the religious aspects of his time, who inculcated many principles very similar to those of the Christians, and without doubt had some acquaintance with the state and history of the Jews.† Next to Plutarch, we should naturally refer to Oenomaus as the author most likely to have left some testimony in regard to the christian church. He lived in the time of Hadrian and wrote a treatise on the falsehood of oracles under the title of: *παρὰ γονῶν* (detection of impostors). Had he intended this now as an attack upon superstition, it would have been very pertinent to his object to have commended the Christians for their contempt of oracles and their abhorrence of the arts of deception; but if, on the contrary, his design was to subvert religion itself, by holding up the gods to ridicule, it would then seem to have fallen very naturally in his way, to deride and censure those, who were introducing new rites of worship. Oenomaus however did not record so much as a word in regard to the Christians. We gather this, not only from the remains, scanty, it is true, of the book just mentioned, but from the fact, that Eusebius neither commends him as the eulogist, nor censures him as the accuser of the Christians.‡

We turn to the Roman writers and we find nearly all of them observing the same silence on the subject, which is observed by the Greeks. Lucan indeed, Silius Italicus, Quinctilian, Martial, Florus, and Curtius Rufus, as they were either poets,

* This passage of Plutarch is found L. IV. Quæst. IV. c. 3. p. 503. tom. III. ed. *Wyttenbach*. *Heumann* in *Actis philos.* Vol. III. p. 911 seq., has it, Christian *Elpistics*: *Brucker*, in *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. III. p. 244, influenced by satisfactory reasons, denies the correctness of this. *Programma Leuschneri* super.

† Which is ascertained e *Convivialium Disputationem Liber IV. Quæst. V. p. 507*, and *Quæst. VI. p. 512*.

‡ The fragments of Oenomaus, in regard to whom there is some account in *Fabricii Bibl. Graec.* Vol. III. p. 622 seq. ed. *Harles*, are found in Eusebius, in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* L. V. c. 18 at the close, and L. VI. c. 6—7.

or teachers of rhetoric, or historians of events prior to their own time, had no very natural occasion for speaking of the christian sect. But that there should not occur even the slightest allusion to them in Juvenal also, who was occupied entirely in describing the manners of his age, nor again in Gellius, and Apuleius, may appear less easy of explanation. Juvenal in particular had very frequent opportunities to notice them: as, for example, in that passage, in which referring to those, who forsook the religion of their country, he says:

“The laws of Rome those blinded bigots slight
In superstitious dread of Jewish rite.
To Moses and his mystic volume true,” etc.*

Was it not here directly in his way to censure also the Christians, who by their observance of foreign rites, showed equal contempt of the Romans? Aulus Gellius in his *Noctes Atticae* has brought together from every quarter whatever seemed to him worthy of notice; but he has passed over entirely all account of the christian religion; and in like manner Luceius Apuleius has neither mentioned the Christians in his *Metamorphoses*, where he speaks of the sacred rites and mysteries of his time; nor in his dissertations on the deity of Socrates and the world, in which the opinions of the Platonists are reviewed, has he directed any of his remarks against them.

Thus nearly all the writers of this period are silent. Some of them indeed mention the Christians, but it is for the most part in very few words, so that it has the appearance of accident, rather than of design. No one speaks of them at all before the age of Trajan: but of those, who wrote in the reign of this emperor, Tacitus, Suetonius and Pliny Secundus, the Younger, have made mention of them. Tacitus, in giving an account of the conflagration of the city, which was supposed to have been set on fire by order of Nero, relates, that the emperor for the purpose of averting suspicion from himself, charged the crime upon the Christians, and inflicted on them punishments of the most studied cruelty; and in this connection he explains the origin of the name which they bore, and characterizes their religion as a pernicious superstition and their spirit as that of hatred towards the human race.† Suetonius in his life of Ne-

* *Satyra XIV. v. 100 sqq.*

† This well known passage is found *Annal. L. XV. c. 44.*

ro* alludes to the same punishments and speaks of the Christians as a class of men addicted to a new and mischievous superstition: and the same writer in his life of Claudius states, that the Jews were expelled from Rome by this emperor, because they were perpetually engaging in disturbances, to which they were instigated by a certain Chrestus.† This Chrestus some have been disposed to regard not as Christus or Christ, but as a man of Greek extraction, whose history is unknown, save that he was a proselyte to the Jewish faith and excited seditions at Rome. The ground of this opinion is, that Suetonius, had he been ever so ignorant of the christian cause, could not have asserted in regard to Christ, that he was personally at Rome and excited seditions there in the reign of Claudius.‡ But the fact is, that the objection, which the learned men who entertain this view, allege, is not authorized by the passage, from which they pretend to derive it. Suetonius relates, that Claudius banished the Jews from Rome, because they were odious to him on account of their constant disturbances, and he supposed that the author of these disturbances was Chrestus, since he had heard that he, although executed as a criminal, had found many followers, who admitted his claims as king of the Jews, and who still survived him. But that the Jews stirred up commotions at Rome, and that Christ was at Rome in the time of Claudius and excited disturbances there, he does not affirm. Hence there is nothing to forbid the supposition, that Suetonius intended to refer to Christ, who by the mere change of a single letter was, as Lactantius testifies, frequently called Chrestus also by others.§ Nor is there any real force in the suggestion of Erasmus, that the idea of instigating can be understood only of a person, who is actually present. For when it is said, that the Jews were *perpetually* raising disturbances, it cannot be meant that they were instigated by the personal agency of the same author.

Suetonius, therefore, has mentioned the Christians twice, but

* c. 16.

† c. 25.

‡ This was the opinion of *Hilscher* in his essay on the Chrestus, of whom Suetonius makes mention. But we have not been able to examine either this or the essays of *Heumann* and *Wirtz* on the Chrestus of Suetonius.

§ Instit. div. L. IV. c. 7. The latest editor of Suetonius, *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Vol. II. p. 55, although not decided in his opinion, still favors our view.

in fewer words than Tacitus and in so cursory a way, that he seems to have been hardly aware of their existence.

In the well known letter of Pliny Secundus, which he wrote to the emperor Trajan, when he was *propraetor* of Bithynia, about the year 104, we have not only more ample, but more certain also, and more important information in regard to the Christians. From this letter we learn, that they were now dispersed in all directions throughout Bithynia, so that many of the temples were abandoned, and the customary rites of religion neglected. For this reason they were accused before the *propraetor*, who considered it his duty to institute an inquiry in regard to these despisers of the public religion, and to adopt measures of severity against them. The course, which was pursued, he explains to the emperor very minutely, and acquaints him also with such further particulars, as he had ascertained in regard to the sect; such as, *that on a stated day they were accustomed to assemble before light, and sing an hymn to Christ, as God, and to bind themselves with an oath, that they would not be guilty of any crime, but would abstain from theft, robbery, adultery, violation of promises, and withholding of property committed to their care*: and he adds, *that the contagion of this superstition* (for so he denominates the christian faith) *had spread, before he had any thought of interfering to check it, not only through the cities, but the villages also and the country in general*. Such facts, as it became him in his capacity of *propraetor* to lay before the emperor, he examined with proper care. But their opinions on religious subjects he had not accurately investigated; nor had he read their sacred books; and that, which he wrote concerning them, was written, not for the purpose of being preserved as a historical record, but merely that the emperor might know, what had been done in the case, and might be enabled to judge in regard to the expediency and nature of any further action.*

* Every one knows, that this letter is the ninety-sixth of the tenth book of the letters of Pliny; in the last edition of which, *Gierigius*, Tom. II. p. 498 sqq. has very ably discussed the question of its genuineness, and maintains it successfully against Semler. *Haversaat* (*Vertheidigung der Plinischen Briefe über die Christen gegen die Einwendungen des Hrn. D. Semler*, Göttingen, 1783) took the same ground before him. This letter, which is found in all the manuscripts, which corresponds exactly to the characters of Pliny and Trajan, which agrees with those circumstances, which we learn from other sources

The same infrequency of allusion to the Christians, which marked the time of Trajan, marked also that of Hadrian. For besides Hadrian himself, who deserves certainly to be ranked among Roman authors (an enthusiastic lover of poetry and letters in general he is called by Spartianus),* Arrian is the only writer, who has referred to them. All the productions of Hadrian indeed have perished, except one letter written to Servianus, which Vopiscus transcribed from the works of Phlegon, a freed man of Hadrian and inserted in the life of Saturninus.† In this letter the emperor inveighs against the manners of the Egyptians, i. e. of the Alexandrians, pronouncing them a most seditious, false and violent class of men; and on this occasion he speaks of the Christians in language as follows: "Those, who worship Serapis, are Christians; and these are those devoted to the service of Serapis, who call themselves the bishops of Christ. There is no ruler of the Jewish synagogue there, no Samaritan, no presbyter of the Christians, who is not an astrologer, a soothsayer, a diviner. The patriarch himself, when he comes to Egypt, is compelled by some to worship Serapis, by others, Christ." At Alexandria, whither men of every description were accustomed to find their way, he had gathered some vague knowledge in regard to the Christians, as well as the observers of other religious rites. The names of presbyters and bishops had thus come to his ears. But as he had vastly more curiosity than love of truth, and was precipitate in his conclusions, he neglected to examine the accuracy of what he heard and thus confounded the Christians with the worshippers of Serapis, who were the sect, to which most of the Alexandrians belonged. Hence too it was, that he imputed to the Christians the same arts of divination, which the adherents of other new and foreign sects were accustomed to practise, which although accounted odious indeed, and frequently punished in the case of the astrologers, were still eagerly sought even by the emperors them-

in regard to the Christians, which has every internal evidence in its favor, and is mentioned by Tertullian, Eusebius and Jerome; this letter, I say, together with the reply of Trajan must surely be considered as genuine, unless you are willing to pronounce all the records of antiquity spurious, and to deny the credibility of history in every case whatever.

* In vita Hadriani, c. 13. p. 12. *Scriptorum historiae Augustae*, ed. Lips.

† c. 8. p. 435 of the book named.

selves. It is thus, it would seem, that we are to account for it, that he should make the altogether false and absurd remarks respecting the Christians, which have been quoted above. Nothing therefore, which Hadrian has left, throws light upon the early history of the church. Nor are we indebted for any thing of this nature to Arrian, who flourished in his reign. All, that we can infer from the passage, in which he refers to the Galileans for the sake of illustration, is that the Christians were considered by Arrian or Epictetus (if these are the words of the master rather than of the disciple), as men, who from the influence of phrenzy and habit (*ὑπο μανίας καὶ ὑπο ἐθους*) could show the same contempt of pain and death, with which reason taught the philosopher to regard them.*

These, so far as we know, are all the instances, in which there occur any reference to the Christians in Greek and Latin writers until the age of the Antonines.

At length in the age of the Antonines, the Christians found able and eloquent advocates of their cause, began to emerge from their obscurity, and to attract the notice of mankind. Still the eyes of all were not turned towards them even then; many, if they were not ignorant of them, at least overlooked them, and no one foresaw in the rise of the Christians the speedy downfall of the whole system of the public religion. In this age, however, especially towards its close, a more general attention was fixed upon them, than had been at any time before; so that some noticed them in brief, yet explicit terms; while others attacked them at greater length, and employed argument against them.

They are mentioned and censured by Galen, a very celebrated physician of that period, and by Marcus Antoninus. Galen refers to them in two places. In one he is speaking of certain physicians and philosophers, who adhere with such obstinacy to their own views, that he, who disputes with them, does nothing but trifle. Having compared them to crooked pieces of

* This passage is contained in Epicteti Dissertationum L. IV. c. 7. p. 618. Tom. 1. ed. Schœig. — But in regard to another passage occurring, L. II. c. 2. p. 214 sq., we dare not pronounce on the question, whether it refers to the Jews or Christians. The Jews indeed, here mentioned, are called *βαπτισται*, which seems to indicate, that Christians are meant. But Jews might be so termed, either on account of their frequent ablutions, or the baptism, to which proselytes were accustomed to submit on their adoption of the Jewish faith.

wood, which can never be straightened, and to withered trees, which, although they are transferred to a new soil, are still unfruitful, he adds, that it is easier to persuade the followers of Moses or Christ to change their sentiments, than it is such physicians and philosophers. * He charges the Christians therefore with an obstinate and unyielding disposition, which made it impossible to reason with them with any hope of success. In the other place he is opposing a certain Archigenes who had maintained, that there are eight variations of the pulse, and says, that he ought to support his views, if not by actual demonstration, yet by appropriate argument, unless a person, as if he belonged to the school of Moses or Christ, (*ὡς εἰς Μοϋσοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ διατριβὴν ἀφιγμένος*) is willing to take assertions for proof (*νομοὺς ἀναποδείκτους*).† He censures therefore equally Christians and Jews as men, who give a blind assent to dogmas, which have never been proved and which are sustained by no evidence.

In a similar manner the Christians are mentioned by Marcus Antoninus, in his Meditations. In that celebrated passage in which their name occurs, the imperial philosopher inquires, what it is, which should produce that state of the soul, as it is about to leave the body, by which, whether it survive the change, or perish, it may be rendered prompt and ready for the issue, which awaits it, and he answers the question by saying that this readiness, *το ἔτοιμον τουτο*, ought to spring from a proper conviction of the mind itself, *ἀπο ιδιᾶς κρίσεως*, such as is characteristic of the truly wise man, *μη κατὰ ψιλὴν καταταξιν, ὡς οὐ χριστιανοί*, not from mere obstinacy, such as is accustomed to produce its effect in the case of the Christians. And the same author adds further, that it becomes man to depart from life *λελογισμένως*, with consideration, *καὶ σεμνῶς*, with dignity, *καὶ ὥστε καὶ ἄλλον πείσαι*, in such a way as to recommend by his example to others also the like firmness of mind, but *ἀτραγωδῶς*, not in the manner of actors, declaiming on the stage; which last words appear to refer to the Christians, who, as they were led to punishment, frequently either boasted of their hope and

* This passage is found in his book *de Pulsuum Differentiis*, L. III. c. 3. Tom. VIII. p. 68. ed. Chart. Tom. VIII. p. 651. ed. Lipsiensis, recently illustrated by *Kuehnins*, my colleague, a most accomplished master of Grecian literature.

† I. I. L. II. c. 4. Tom. VIII. p. 43. ed. Chart. Tom. VIII. p. 579. ed. Lips.

joy, or sung an hymn to Christ, or exhorted their brethren to constancy and contempt of death. Marcus Antoninus therefore considered the Christians, many of whom were persecuted in his own reign, as men, who in despising death, which some of them in their eagerness for martyrdom are said to have even sought, exhibited, not wisdom, but stubbornness and obstinacy, and who departed from life, as if from a stage, like actors rehearsing their parts. *

This is the only place, in which Marcus Antoninus has spoken of the Christians; nor can we adduce any thing further, which gives us more accurate information in regard to his opinions concerning them. For those two letters, which are attributed to him, one of which he is said to have addressed to the Roman senate, the other to the Common of Asia (το κοινον Ἀσίας, sc. συνέδριον), i. e. to the common council of the Asiatic cities, we regard as spurious, and think, that they were forged by some Christians with the design of recommending to the emperor of their times a lenient policy towards themselves, from the example of those previous emperors, whom posterity most applauded. In regard to the former of these letters, in which Marcus communicates to the Roman Senate intelligence respecting a signal victory, which he had obtained over the Marcomanni near the river Granua, and which he ascribes to the prayers of the thundering legion, no defence can be attempted for a moment.† In support of the genuineness of the other, some things were formerly said and have of late been repeated, which are not altogether without plausibility. But still there are many difficulties, which forbid assent. For not to insist on the manifest inconsistency between the office of the emperor, who as Pontifex Maximus presided over the public institutions of religion and the remark at the commencement of the letter, that it belongs to the gods themselves to punish the despisers of their divinity, not to men, it is

* This place is found in the Commentaries of Marcus Antoninus, L. XI. c. 3. The word *παρὰταξως* is derived from military operations, where line is opposed to line, soldier to soldier. If this be done rashly, it is mere obstinacy and stubbornness. In like manner the word *παρὰτασσοῦν* is used L. VIII. c. 48.

† By Kestner in the work, *Die Agape oder der geheime Weltbund der Christen*, p. 399, sqq., against whom Eichstaedt in *quarta Exercitationum Antoniniarum*. Also separately published, and recently inserted in Vol. I. *Annalium academiae Tienensis*, has urged such arguments, that we feel fully confirmed in our opinion.

surely a circumstance, which must strike every critic as suspicious, that his epistle is mentioned neither by Athenagoras, who addressed his *Πρεσβεια* to the same emperor, and omitted nothing, which could redound to his credit, or would be likely to conciliate his favor towards the Christians, nor by Melito even in that passage of his Apology presented to the same emperor in which he refers to the edict issued by Hadrian and Antoninus Pius in favor of the christian party. * It is not therefore without sufficient grounds for the rejection, that we have set aside the letters ascribed to Marcus Antoninus and have cited as the only pertinent passage in his works the one, which occurs in the Commentaries, of which the emperor himself is at once the author and the subject ; in which the Christians indeed are mentioned, but in such a manner, that he seems to have done it from accident, rather than from design.

But with the exception of Galen and Marcus Antoninus himself, all those, who lived in the age of the Antonines, and made mention of the Christians at all, noticed them, not in a few words, but with particularity, and entered into controversy with them. For this reason they have been called, and with propriety too, the first opponents of the Christians ; among whom we should mention Crescens, a Cynic, Fronto a very celebrated rhetorician and one of the teachers of Marcus Antoninus, Lucian of Samosata, and finally Celsus, a philosopher either of the Epicurean or Platonic school.

Crescens, who leads the way in the train of these writers, lived at Rome in the reign of Antoninus Pius, and there denounced the Christians in a public manner. He disputed with Justin, the Martyr so called, and in revenge for the censure, which the latter applied to the philosophers, carried his hostility to him so far, as to plot against his life. These facts are made known to us by Justin and his disciple Tatian, to whom Eusebius is indebted for all his statements, which relate to Crescens.† Justin does not indeed state in express terms, that he *wrote* against the Christians ; nor can we infer this from his saying, that he, *δημοσια και προς χαριν και ηδονην των πολλων*, publicly and for the purpose of gratifying the multitude and ob-

* Eusebius has preserved a fragment of the Apology of Melito in *Historia Eccles.* L. IV. c. 26.

† See *Justini Apologia* II. c. 3. p. 90 sq., *Tatiani oratio adversus Graecos*, c. 3. p. 260. ed. *Benedict*; et *Eusebii hist. Eccles.* L. IV. c. 16.

taining their applause, censured the Christians as *ἄθεοι καὶ ἀσεβεῖς*. For all which this language implies may have been done in the form of conversations, either in a school, or in some other of the customary resorts for discussion. But when Justin speaks in the same place of questions proposed by himself, and replies given to them by Crescens, and says, that he is ignorant, whether they were carried to the emperors or not, we are led to conclude, that Crescens had, not only oral, but also written controversy with the Christians. That however he was an ordinary and obscure man, and that his works were but little read, is shown with much certainty by the entire absence of all allusion to him in Greek and Roman writers, and by the very rare occurrence of it in christian writers.

Crescens is followed by Fronto Cirtensis, a very eminent rhetorician of the age of the Antonines, and the author of some highly celebrated orations and letters, the remains of which Angelus Maius has recently discovered and given to the public. Antoninus Pius appointed him teacher of Roman eloquence to the young princes, Marcus Aurelius, and Lucius Verus, and honored him with the office of consul. In his being chosen to places of such trust and distinction, we have sufficient proof of the high estimation, in which he was held. In respect now to this man so conspicuous for his scholarship and rank, Minucius Felix, his contemporary, has stated in his *Octavius*, (in which work the cause of the Christians is ably defended), that he wrote against the Christians, and accused them of holding assemblies, in which they were guilty of incest. Minucius communicates nothing further in regard to him; for that the arguments, which are urged against the Christians by Caecilius, who in the *Octavius* personates the part of a defender of the received religion, were in fact those of Fronto, is a mere conjecture, which some have approved, because Minucius Felix appears to have imitated the eloquence of Fronto. Nothing has been transmitted either by Minucius Felix or any other writer, which explains either on what occasion Fronto wrote against the Christians, or what object he proposed to secure by his attack upon them. But we adopt perhaps an opinion, which probability supports, if not history, when we assume that the rhetorician, as he belonged to the court of Marcus Aurelius, in whose reign many of the Christians were accused of murder and the most infamous licentiousness, wrote against them, for the purpose of justifying the emperor in the severity of his

edicts against them. With such a design, he would naturally be interested to show, that they were guilty of the charges for which they suffered. This, it would seem, is the view, which many have taken. The particulars, which we learn in regard to Fronto, are indeed few, yet important to be known, because we discover from them, that there had arisen enemies of the Christians even thus early in the very palace of the emperor, and that their apologists had ample cause for vindicating them against the crimes, which were imputed to them.*

We come next to Lucian. Upon him we shall have occasion to dwell longer, than was necessary in the case of Fronto. This writer mentions the Christians expressly in two places; for the *Philopatris*, in which there are many things said against them, is not from the hand of Lucian of Samosata, but was produced so late, as in the time of Julian.† One of these passages is found in the book, entitled, *Alexander or Pseudomantis*, where it is stated that this Alexander, the founder of certain new religious rites, and a crafty impostor, had been accustomed, in imitation of the caution, which the guardians of the Eleusinian mysteries observed in this matter, to exclude equally Christians and Epicureans from a knowledge of his secrets.‡ The other passage, from which Lucian's opinion relative to the Christians is known, occurs in his book on the death of *Peregrinus*, the famous Cynic, who, if Lucian relates the truth, ended a life of the basest depravity and crime by burning himself about the year 166, in the presence of a vast concourse of people, at Olympia. Lucian here mentions among other things in regard to this *Peregrinus*, who wished to be called *Proteus*, that he had learned *την θαυμαστην σοφίαν των χριστιανων*; and that having attained among them the rank of prophet and hierarch he was worshipped by them as a god; and on this account he stigmatizes them as men, who were credulous and who could be easily deceived by any impostor. The same

* The places in *Minucius Felix*, which relate to Fronto, occur in his *Octavius* c. 9 and c. 31. In regard to the life and writings of Fronto, *Angelus Maius* has treated in a learned manner in *M. Cornelii Frontonis Opp. ed. P. I. p. 1 sqq.*

† This has been satisfactorily shown by *Gessner* in his dissertation concerning the age and author of the dialogue, entitled *Philopatria*, and bearing the name of Lucian; and which is inserted *Opp. Luc. Tom. II. ed. Reiz. p. 708.*

‡ c. 38. p. 244. *Tom. II. ed. Reiz.*

writer moreover has much to say in reference to the zeal of the Christians in behalf of Peregrinus, while he lay in prison and chains, on the charge of being a Christian. He represents them as assembling from every quarter, and attempting by every method to effect his release, as encouraging and consoling him in his captivity and showing to him as much regard and veneration, as if he had been a second Socrates. His design in these statements, if we mistake not, was, to make it appear that they were men of a factious spirit and withheld by no scruples from any crime, which would promote their cause. He still further styles the Christians wretches, who in the hope that they should prove immortal in soul and body, regard death with a stupid contempt, and suffer themselves to be persuaded, that they are brethren, because having abandoned the gods of the Greeks they worship the crucified sophist, and live according to his precepts ; and believe these and other absurdities without evidence ; so that it is not strange, that any impostor, who understands at all the arts of management, can easily rise to wealth among them and impose on their simplicity to any extent.* Thus Lucian censured the Christians as ignorant, credulous and superstitious men. But he never controverted their opinions or argued against their apologists, either because he had no knowledge of them, or, which we think nearer the truth, because he wished to appear to hold in contempt those, who by their observance of new rites of religion were the objects of his scorn. For we deem it scarcely credible, that Lucian, unequalled, as he was, by any man of his age, in his knowledge of public and private affairs, and in his intimate acquaintance both by travel and correspondence with persons of every rank and place, should have been altogether ignorant of the writings of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and even of Tatian, his own countryman ; (for Tatian was by birth a Syrian).

But while in these places Lucian has reviled the Christians in express terms, he *appears* to have aimed at them indirect censure everywhere in his books on the true art of history. We think, however, that he has actually done this only in a few cases : for having changed our opinion, we do not at present assent to those views, which Krebs has maintained on this subject, although Eichstaedt has recently sanctioned them by

* The reader will find these remarks in the book referred to, on the death of Peregrinus, c. 11—13. p. 233—338. tom. III.

his approbation.* All those remarks, which are supposed to refer either to the prophet Jonah living three days in the whale's belly, or to Christ walking upon the sea, or to the contest of the archangel Michael with Satan, described in the Apocalypse, are so introduced, that they may have been written either for the purpose of jest, or of ridiculing the Greeks for their credulity and superstition, even by a man, who had not the least knowledge of the Christians. The story of the mariners, which Lucian is so minute in relating, who having sailed a thousand and five hundred stadia, come to certain islands and cities, situated in the belly of a huge animal, where they find herbs and creatures of every sort, and whence after the expiration of a year and six months they emerge and again traverse the deep, is entirely dissimilar to the account, which the sacred Scriptures give concerning the prophet Jonah.† In like manner his narrative in regard to the battle of Endymion and the Selenitæ, inhabitants of the moon, with Phaethon and Helios, inhabitants of the sun, is understood surely, with great latitude of construction, in being supposed to refer to the battle of Michael and Satan. For had Lucian designed to allude to this battle, related in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse, he should have wrought into his description such circumstances, as would be pertinent to that character of an accuser, which Satan bears, and also to that blood of the Lamb, by which he is overcome. Besides the battle of Endymion and Phaethon terminates in a peace favorable to both: whereas that of Michael and Satan ends in the victory of Michael who hurls his adversary from the heavens.‡ These therefore and other passages are thought to have but a forced application to the records of sacred history. At the same time there are some things in the writings of Lu-

* See *Krebs* in regard to the malicious designs of Lucian to make the Christian religion appear weak and ridiculous, in *Diss. in ejus d. opusc. acad. et scholast.* p. 308 sqq. Also *Eichstaedt* in *Diss.* published at Jena 1820, on the question, whether Lucian wished by what he wrote to aid the Christian cause. In our work, with the title of *Historiae Apologeticae* Lips. 1805, we adopted the opinion of *Krebs*. But at present we are inclined to a different view in respect to very many of the passages adduced by this learned man.

† The story of the ship entering the mouth of a whale is given in his work *de vera Historia* L. I. c. 30—40. p. 94—101.

‡ The account of the battle between Endymion and Phaethon may be read l. l. c. 10—21. p. 77—87.

cian, which even in our view admit of this reference. We consider it necessary to understand thus what he says concerning a city, situated upon the islands of the blessed, which is all gold and surrounded with walls of emerald.* Since the idea of such a city upon these islands never occurs in any of the Greek writers, it would seem not improbable that Lucian had his thoughts on the heavenly Jerusalem, of whose descent upon the earth the Chiliasts were in constant expectation, and which the author of the Apocalypse represents as effulgent with the splendor of the most costly gems. In like manner we should refer to the same origin, we think, what he says in regard to fountains full of honey and rivers of milk, as well as what he observes respecting Peregrinus, that by his death he left his followers orphan†—in which case he seems to have designed to express himself in imitation of our Lord in John, 14: 18, *οὐκ ἀφῆκα ὑμᾶς ὀρφανούς*.

But all these instances, as Eichstaedt has justly remarked, are rather conjectural than certain. The views of learned men will always differ in regard to the interpretation of passages of this nature. After what has been adduced, however, from his book on the death of Peregrinus, there can be no doubt, that Lucian entertained opinions, which did great injustice to the Christians; and no one, we are sure, can read the evidence of this and still allow himself to think, that he favored them and wished to aid their cause.‡ The idea is entirely unsupported; it is almost absurd. Lucian ridiculed indeed the gods of the Greeks, and denounced the rites of their religion; but he did this, that he might expose to contempt that, which both in his view and in fact deserved such exposure; and not by any means that he might prepare the way for the triumph of the Christians, to whom he rendered, if any, an unintentional assistance. He could scoff at one form of religion as readily as another; and in truth he made it as much his aim to efface from the minds of men every vestige of piety, as to put an end to the reign of superstition.

* I. I. L. II. c. II. p. III.

† De morte Peregrin c. 6. p. 330.

‡ In the dissertation of *Eichstaedt* against *Kestner* in regard to the intentions of Lucian, to which we have already referred, there are some ingenious remarks on the topic in question, which deserve to be read.

If Lucian considered it sufficient to censure and revile the Christians, Celsus, his contemporary, (for it is highly probable, that the Celsus, refuted by Origen, is the individual, to whom Lucian dedicated his *Pseudomantis*), * felt it expedient to take other ground. He lived towards the end of the age of the Antonines, and came forward against the supporters of Christianity, as an assailant of their opinions, as a defender of the public religion against the ruin, with which he saw that they were threatening it, and as the author of charges, which represented them as factious, insurrectionary and dangerous to the State. His work, entitled, *λογος φιλαληθης*, is extant but in part. From the remains of it, however, not inconsiderable, which Origen has preserved with the very words of the author in his eight books, which he wrote in reply to Celsus, it is evident, that he was no stranger to the circumstances of the Christians, that he employed in his attacks upon them both raillery and argument, and in short that he spared nothing, which would serve either to invalidate their opinions, or expose them to hatred. In this book Celsus anticipated the part of the Neo-Platonists, who in subsequent times were distinguished for their support of the public religion, and their opposition to the Christians; although he himself, in our opinion, was not a Platonist, but an Epicurean, and was led to assume the position, which he took, not from any impulse of piety, but rather from a regard to the consistency of his own character. Having displayed so much zeal against new and foreign rites (for the chief ground on which he rested his censure of the Christians, was that they embraced *βαρβαρον δογμα* and *νομοθεσιαν καινην*), he felt that it became him to give his support to that, which had the sanction of custom and the authority of law.

Celsus completes the list of those writers, who took notice of the Christians from the time of Domitian to the conclusion of the age of the Antonines. We have now before us the facts, which the case involves. It remains that we explain why it is, that the early history of the church received so little attention from Greek and Roman authors.

* The ground of this assumption is this; *Lucian* in the piece, which is entitled *Pseudomantis*, c. 21. p. 229. Tom. II., mentions some books on magic written by the Celsus, to whom this same piece is dedicated and *Origen contra Cels.* L. I. p. 53. ed. Spenc. says, that it is very probable, that the Celsus, refuted by himself, is the same person, to whom the books on magic are attributed.

The references, which these authors make to this subject, until A. D. 180, the end of the age of the Antonines, are truly inconsiderable, whether we have respect to their number or their importance. For most of them, as the result of the foregoing examination shows, were entirely silent in regard to the Christians, some of them mentioned them briefly and censured them in few words, (even Lucian was far from speaking of them with any thing like minuteness), and at length in the age of the Antonines, Crescens, Fronto and Celsus took up the pen against them. The question therefore is very properly asked, why the Greek and Roman writers alluded to the Christians thus rarely? and it is a question surely, which deserves to be carefully investigated.

In the prosecution of this inquiry, it is important to distinguish properly the different periods, which the limits of our survey embrace. In the age of the Antonines, the Christians had obtained notoriety; but in the reigns of Domitian, Trajan, and Hadrian, we suppose, that they were so situated, as to be altogether unknown to multitudes, or known to them only by name. Even down to the time of Trajan they were considered as a mere sect or family of the Jews, and were then, for the most part, safe, as Tertullian says, * under the shadow of the toleration, which was extended to the Jewish religion. Nor is there any thing singular in this, since at this period most of the Christians were converts from the Jews, and their churches, whether we consider the form of their government or the mode of their worship, differed but little from the synagogues. Like the Jews, the Christians were accustomed to meet on the Sabbath to offer prayers, read the Scriptures and sing praises; as the Jews had their chief rulers of the synagogue and their elders, so the Christians had their presbyters and bishops, who presided over their affairs; and the latter, as well as the former, abhorred the gods of the heathen, refused to accept public offices and to perform military service, and shunned theatres, shows and feasts. Not a few Syrians indeed, born at Antioch, Egyptians born at Alexandria, Greeks, natives of Corinth and Athens, Romans, residents at Rome, espoused the Christian cause, and at length by degrees *οἱ ἐκ τῆς ἀποβυστίας* were so increased, that in many places they either equalled or exceeded the number *τῶν ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς*. But the Christians, notwithstanding this accession,

* In Apologetico c. 21. p. 53. ed. Semleri.

were still regarded as a part of the Jewish community. For it was but the recurrence of what often took place, that those who were by birth either Egyptians or Grecians or Romans, became proselytes to Judaism and lived in the observance of its rites. Nor did it make any difference, that the Jews and Christians were at variance with each other. Those who ascertained any thing in regard to these dissensions, were very naturally led to confound them with the domestic feuds and animosities of the various parties, into which the Jews were divided. This was the opinion of those Roman magistrates, who replied to the Jews, when they charged the apostle Paul with breaking the law, that these were *ζητήματα περι λόγου, και ὀνομάτων και νομου*, or *ζητήματα περι της ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας*. *

Besides, there were not many among the Christians of that time, either conspicuous for rank and birth, or eminent for literary fame, towards whom the eyes of all would be attracted. Those certainly err, who suppose, that they were gathered from the very lowest dregs of the people. The authority of Caecilius, who in the Octavius of Minucius Felix acts the part of an accuser of the Christians, and who reproaches them with precisely such an origin, has an undue influence, when made the basis of such an opinion. It cannot be doubted, that from the very first not a few persons of no mean consideration, in regard both to property and mental culture, enrolled themselves on the side of Christ. For what could Paul and Peter have meant by admonishing the women, who were believers, that they should not make their adorning consist of necklaces, pearls, gold and silver, and costly raiment,† unless there were those in the churches, who were able to procure for themselves expensive apparel? And with what consistency too could Lucian remark, as he does in the passage already cited, that any impostor who should join the Christians, might easily become rich among them, had they been a troop of paupers and mendicants? Nor were the Christians all ignorant and illiterate men; they always had those in their ranks, who could not only speak, but write in explanation and defence of their principles; and who in their public assemblies could discourse upon the subjects of religion and comment on the Scriptures, although it might not be indeed in the style of orators, who had been taught the art of rhetoric.

* See Actor. 18: 21. 23: 29. 25: 19.

† 1 Tim. 2: 9. 1 Pet. 3: 3.

Sometimes also an individual of noble birth and station appears to have joined their number. It is highly probable, that Flavius Clemens, a consul, cousin of the emperor Domitian, and his wife, Domitilla, became converts to Christianity. As to the statement indeed of Dio Cassius, that they had fallen into such error, as to embrace *τα ἡθῆ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, it may be understood alike of the Christian and the Jewish religion. The accusation however *τῆς ἀθεότητος*, which they are said to have incurred, inclines us to suppose, that the former was meant rather than the latter; since this charge was often alleged against the Christians but could not easily apply to the Jews.* Still it must certainly be allowed, that the Christians were, for the most part, from the lower walks of life, and but little acquainted with Grecian and Roman letters. For had it been otherwise, Caecilius, in the Octavius of Minucius Felix, could neither have said, with all the liberty of exaggeration, which may be claimed for him as an accuser, that they *were collected from the lowest dregs*, nor have addressed to them the language—*behold; both the greater and better part of you, as you yourselves say, are in want, suffer cold, contempt and hunger.*† And in like manner Celsus could have had no pretence for saying, that those who displayed such zeal to proselyte children and ignorant women, *ἐργουργοὺς εἶναι, καὶ σκυτοτομοὺς, καὶ κραγεῖς, ἀπαιδεύτους καὶ ἄγροὺ νοταροὺς* (that they were wool-dressers, and leather-cutters and fullers, uneducated and rustic men).‡ But if there was room even in the age of the Antonines for the application of such language to the Christians, as Caecilius and Celsus used in reference to them, it is to be still less expected, that their earlier annals were adorned with the names either of the learned or the noble. We may imagine some resemblance in this respect between the primitive churches and the modern societies of the Mennonites and Quakers. These latter consisted chiefly of mechanics, artists, and merchants, men of principle and respectability indeed, possessed also of some information and property, yet in few instances eminent either for learning or birth or opulence. The first churches, it should be remembered, were small and made up of those, who not only lived in the shades of private life, but, from their

* *Dio Cassius* L. LXVII. c. 14. p. 1112. ed. Hamb.

† c. 8. and c. 12.

‡ See *Origines contra Celsum*, L. III. p. 144. ed. Spene.

constant fear of danger, had every motive to evade rather than court the public observation. (On this account they are called by Caecilius a light-fleeing, skulking, speechless tribe.)* They were established too, not in towns and villages where all things of a private nature become public, but in large and populous cities, where the eyes of men notice only that, which is, as it were, thrust upon their attention. It is easy to conceive, that the Christians, under such circumstances, may have been utterly unknown to multitudes of their contemporaries. We have no doubt that there are many in London at this day, who know nothing in regard to the Quakers or the Baptists ; and we have ascertained it for a fact, that very many of our own citizens are ignorant, that there is a small community at Leipsic, who worship in the manner of the Bohemian brethren. In the same way we suppose that great numbers of the Antiochians, Alexandrians, Romans, Athenians, Thessalonians, had at that time either no knowledge of the Christians, or only such as acquainted them with their name as Galilaeans, and their Jewish origin. Those things, which neither dazzle the eyes of men by their splendor, nor awaken in their minds admiration or abhorrence, nor allure them by the hope of gain and the prospect of pleasure, often remain concealed for a long time from the general view.

But in the age of the Antonines the Christians were no longer unknown. They ceased, from the time of Trajan, to be confounded with the Jews, and occupied henceforth a separate and conspicuous station in the eyes of the world. All those, who were accustomed to pay any attention to public affairs, could not but know, that the churches differed entirely from the synagogues, that the Christians observed rites of religion peculiar to themselves, that they abhorred the gods, worshipped by the heathen, that they were bound to each other by stronger ties, than were those of other sects, that they had been repeatedly punished by the magistrates, and treated with indignity and violence by the multitude in revenge for the contempt, which they saw cast upon the objects of their worship. At the same time, most of those, who were aware of these and similar facts respecting the Christians, imagined that they saw nothing in them very remarkable ; and, under this belief, they of course had no sufficient motive either for investigating their

* See *Mitacii Felicis Octavius*, c. 8.

history or transmitting any information on the subject. So far certainly as regards the novelty of the christian religion, it is not strange, that it did not arrest and fix the attention of men. At this very period, in all the large and populous cities, particularly at Rome and Alexandria, not only foreign rites of worship, brought from all parts of the earth, like those in honor of Isis and Mithra, were from time to time making their appearance, but frequently new ceremonies (*καιναι τελεται*) like those of the Alexander, whom Lucian assailed under the name of Pseudomantis, were instituted. Nor did it appear wonderful, that the Christians worshipped the Deity without temples, altars and images. For the Jews, dispersed throughout the Roman world, had been accustomed everywhere to offer their devotions in a similar manner. But little importance again was attached to the invectives, with which the Christians denounced the gods of the heathen. In this they were not singular: for many of the philosophers also despised and ridiculed the gods. Nor was it deemed a matter, which deserved to interest specially the public mind, that the Christians suffered at one time from civil persecution, and at another from the violence of the multitude. The State was thrown into no very serious commotion either by the tumults of the people, demanding the sacrifice of their victims, or by the decisions of the judges, dooming them to death. Those too, who perished in this way, were obscure men, whose fate was not deemed of sufficient consequence to merit a place in history.

Add to this, that many of the Greeks and Romans held the Christians in contempt as the observers of Jewish rites, and also detested them, both on account of the crimes, which were laid to their charge, and the insubordinate, restless spirit, which was supposed to animate them. It is well known, that the Greeks and Romans regarded the Jews as a barbarous, superstitious, and illiterate people, and for this reason felt no interest in their concerns. In this way many were led to look upon the Christians also in the same light; who, as they derived their religion from the Jews, worshipped Jesus Christ, who was born among the Jews, acknowledged the prophets of the Jews as the messengers of God, and regulated their churches after the pattern of the synagogue, were supposed to practise Jewish rites and imitate the manners of the Jews. To contempt were frequently added hatred and indignation. Those, who cherished such feelings towards them, did in fact but their duty, if they considered

them really guilty of celebrating feasts, at which they committed murder and incest. That the suspicion of such guilt was deeply fixed in the minds of many, may be learned from the efforts of the Apologists, who left no stone unturned in their anxiety to clear themselves from these accusations, (*Θυσια δειπνα* and *Οἱ διποδείοι μιγείς*, as they are called by the Greeks). But those, who placed no confidence in uncertain rumor, or who knew, that these imputations were false, were still displeased, that men so obscure and illiterate should affect to be wise above their condition, and refuse to conform to what the laws prescribed. This was natural. For it is common for men in the higher walks of life to censure those things, which are contrary to the established laws and usages, although, while they deny the right to others, they themselves assert the liberty of disregarding and renouncing them, as they please. Hence many, who discovered but little zeal themselves in the worship of the gods, condemned the Christians for their contempt of the public services of religion, and pronounced it mere obstinacy, that they refused to burn incense to the gods, and swear by the divinity of the emperor.

Such we consider to be the explanation of the fact that most of the Greek and Roman writers, even in the age of the Antonines, were either entirely silent in respect to the Christians, or confined their notice of them to brief and cursory allusions. They appeared to observe nothing in them, which was particularly worthy either of their own attention, or the information of posterity ; and, as they either despised them, as a branch of the Jews, or hated them for the infamous crimes, of which they were suspected, and for their seditious spirit, it was impossible, that they should have been otherwise than hostile to their cause.

But all the Greeks and Romans, who were distinguished for their attention to letters, did not entertain such an opinion of the Christians, or rest satisfied with so superficial a knowledge of their affairs. The Apologies, written by Justin, Melito, Athenagoras, and others, were composed with too much ability and dispersed by the Christians with too much zeal, to allow us to suppose, that they were but little read. Those, therefore, who had seen these defences, or had met with the Christians in the intercourse of life, could not have failed to know, that they were not only guiltless of the crimes, with which they were charged, but taught doctrines and rules of conduct, which accorded with the sentiments of the most celebrated philosophers.

It may perhaps be further inquired then, why the Christians found no eulogists among the philosophers, who were superior to the multitude in wisdom, and entertained more correct views upon religious subjects.

The fact now here is, that many of those, who rejected indeed the public religion as mere superstition, but still adhered to its forms as an expression of their reverence for the Deity, and as an aid to the development of their moral nature, became not merely eulogists of the Christians, but in very deed Christians themselves. Of this number were Quadratus, Aristides, Melito, Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Minucius Felix, and many others, who, natives either of Syria, or Greece, or Egypt, or Africa, adopted the christian faith, transferred to the church their various accomplishments in Grecian and Roman science, and, especially in the age of the Antonines, advocated the cause of the Christians. All these men, averse indeed to the public belief, yet possessing minds ever wakeful on religious subjects, joined the christian church, because it presented to them views of truth, to which their hearts responded, because it spread before them a sacred history, which bore, as it were, the marks of a witness and messenger of the Deity, and prescribed to its members, united in the bonds of a common faith and mutual love, the duties, which are best suited to the cultivation of a pious spirit. No inconsiderable number, therefore, who had been enabled by the aid of Grecian philosophy to rise to more worthy conceptions of religion than those of the multitude, cordially approved and embraced the doctrines of Christianity. But those philosophers, who became Christians, are to be classed, not among the Greeks and Romans, who are the subjects of our present inquiry, but among the Christian writers, whom it would be out of place here to notice.

Others however of this class, and those by far the majority, took a different view; they condemned the Christian rites and withheld from them every expression of their sympathy and favor. Some of them did this from their regard to the authority of law and custom which weighed with them far more than the acknowledged defects of the public religion; and others again, from the contempt, in which they held every thing sacred.

Of this number were the Stoics and Platonists, who preceded the Neo-Platonists so called *κατ' ἐξοχην*. The Platonists of these times, as Plutarch, Alcinous, Apuleius, and the Stoics, as Arrian and Marcus Antoninus, having derived from philosophy

many correct notions of religious truth, perceived, that the mythic fictions contained much that was absurd and equally unworthy of gods and men, favored the idea, that the worship of the Deity depended on the state of the mind, rather than on the performance of external services, and distinguished very justly between *εὐσεβεία* and *δεισιδαιμονία*. In the works of Plutarch especially there occur many noble sentiments on religious subjects, showing that he and those like him had advanced beyond the multitude in their conceptions of truth, and taught not a few principles very similar to those of the christian religion. But most of these philosophers were unwilling, that the established forms of worship should be abandoned, and others substituted for them. They revered them, because they were supported by law and custom ; and feared, lest if their national and ancient institutions should give place to those of foreign and recent origin, it might derange the whole order and frame of society. For this reason they either considered it the part of a wise man to follow philosophy as his guide in private life, but in public life to conform to the laws and worship in the ancient manner, or to endeavor, by divesting the received mythology of its literal sense, and understanding it to teach only physical and moral truths, or by distinguishing between daemons and gods and referring to the former every thing of an unworthy nature, to improve the public religion and harmonize it with the doctrines of philosophy. Those now, who thought and did thus, could not have patronized the cause of the Christians, nor have appeared as the eulogists of those, who were despising the public rites, who were censuring, and ridiculing them, and preparing the way for their ruin. Many things indeed taught by the Christians they approved as perfectly agreeable to right reason. But they were of the opinion, that a knowledge of divine and human subjects was to be sought, not from the Christians, but from the philosophers of their own country, far excelling in their estimation both in acuteness and eloquence the prophets of the Jews and the apostles, founders of the christian church. Thus the cause of the Christians was not favored even by those philosophers, who approached very nearly to them in the sentiments which they entertained.

But those, by whom sacred rites of every description were despised, and all religion accounted as superstition, had still other reasons either for neglecting or censuring the followers of Christ. To this class belonged the Epicureans, and Cynics ;

which is learned not only from Plutarch, who frequently characterizes the Epicureans as *ἀθεοὺς*, and censures severely* their *γέλως* and *χλευασμὸν*, but also from the example of Lucian, who embraced the Epicurean philosophy. For Lucian not only ridiculed the heathen mythology, exhibited the Grecian gods in a ridiculous light and held up to contempt the public ceremonies, but also especially in those treatises, of which one is entitled *Ζεὺς ἐλεγχόμενος*, the other *Ζεὺς Τραγωδός*, argued against religion itself, and endeavored to subvert the doctrine of a Divine Being, who is interested in the concerns of men.† Philosophers now, discarding thus the idea of a Divine power, could not but have extended that contempt which they felt for all religion, to the christian religion also, and have turned with abhorrence from those, whom they considered either as the authors or supporters of a new superstition. Nor did those attacks, which were made by the Christians upon the prevalent errors, have any special tendency to conciliate their favor. They supposed, that they themselves, following in the steps of Evemerus and other philosophers of past times, had fully discovered and proved the vanity, senselessness and absurdity of the mythic system.

It is therefore sufficiently accounted for, that the Christians even at that time, when they had now become generally known, found, not a few followers indeed, but no eulogists and advocates among the philosophers.

But those of these philosophers, who felt such a dislike to the Christians, because they were unwilling, that the public rites, established by law and custom, should be disturbed and abolished, appear to have had appropriate reasons, not so much for neglecting to speak of their affairs, as for arraigning the correctness of their opinions. For the Christians surely were preparing the way for the ruin of those rites: their poets, known by the name of Sibyllists, were, in imitation of the author of the Apocalypse, predicting it; and their apologists, seeking the same result in every possible way, made no secret of the fact, that they too desired it, that they prayed and labored, that all would abandon the temples and altars of idols and turn to the true God. It may therefore be very properly asked, why no one, except Celsus, (for Crescens and Fronto appear to have

* See his book *de Oraculorum Defectu*, c. 19.

† See particularly his *Zeus Tragoedus*, c. 42—49. p. 694—698. Tom. II. ed. Reitz.

merely personated the character of assailants and accusers), endeavored to convict the Christians of error, and defend the public religion against them. Those, who might have done this, we answer, appear to have neglected it, because they supposed, that there was but little to be feared from the Christians. Foreign religious rites had been often introduced, and the Jewish ceremonies had already been a long time practised without any danger to the public religion. The Christians, few in number, suspected by the magistrates, odious to the multitude, and not protected indeed by public law from the fear of punishment, seemed not to be the persons, who were to overturn those institutions, which had been received from their fathers, which were guarded by the authority of the State, which had become sacred through the veneration of ages. No one could at that time have easily predicted, that domestic usages were soon to give place to foreign ; ancient, to modern ; Greek and Roman, to those, which had sprung from Judea, and that the opinions of mankind, the laws of the empire, and the religion of the whole Roman world, were about to be changed by the efforts of the Christians. The christian church, in all its early progress, was weak ; and even in the age of the Antonines was so destitute of the influence, arising either from numbers or the support of literary men, that it could have presented no very threatening aspect towards the rites of paganism, with whatever earnestness it might have sought their overthrow. There seemed to be no occasion for the pen in opposing those, who were falling by the sword. There were a few indeed of such sagacity, that, like Celsus, they saw, that the elements of a mighty revolution were concealed in the principles of the Christians ; but for the most part they were deceived by the external appearance of things, and supposed that their few and feeble churches would soon be exterminated. It was a mistake, into which men are liable to fall, who estimate by number and weight the power of what depends upon human thought and volition.

Still further ; those, who were unwilling that the public rites should be disturbed and abolished, are not to be considered as having been so attached to them, that they would not suffer any thing to be said in disparagement of them. Neither against Oenomaus, who in the time of Hadrian assailed the art of divination,* nor against Lucian, who in the age of the Antonines

* His book, of which fragments by no means inconsiderable have been preserved by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica*, L. V. cap.

ridiculed and exposed the gods, did any come forward to defend the religion of their fathers. Besides, it was no easy matter to restore the Grecian theology, neglected as it had long been, and reconcile with philosophy a religion, which was founded upon the senses and in many respects directly at variance with correct reason. It cannot therefore appear singular, that in the age of the Antonines no one, except Celsus, supported the cause of the public religion by attacking the opinions of the Christians. For although the Platonists were every where numerous, yet it was not until the third century that the Neo-Platonic philosophy, which furnished the defenders of the national faith with the most convenient weapons, began at length to prevail.

The examination, into which we have thus gone, furnishes a satisfactory answer, we think, to the question, which we proposed to consider. It has been our design to treat it in such a way, that it might be seen, that it is no discredit to Christianity, that it so rarely attracted the attention of Greek and Roman writers. Unless we are deceived, we have not failed to accomplish our purpose. For we think, that it is abundantly evident from what has been said, that the authors, of whom we have spoken, had either absolutely no reasons for mentioning the Christians, or such as would lead them to do it but very seldom.

But the fewer the facts, which we learn from these authors, in reference to the christian cause, the more highly should we prize the writings of the apostles, apostolic fathers, and apologists, of which, fortunately we have such ample remains. By the perusal and study of these records of early Christianity, we may fully acquaint ourselves with the progress and arguments of the primitive believers. So far from its being adverse to the truth, nothing, on the contrary, contributes so much to excite the mind to its contemplation, as familiarity with the history of the ancient church.

18 sqq. L. VI. c. 6 sqq., was entitled, *ῥωρα γοντων*, detection of impostors. Cf. *Fabricii Bibl. Graec.* Vol. III. p. 522 sq. ed. *Harles*.

ARTICLE XI.

CONNECTION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Translated from the German of Professor Twesten of Berlin. By B. B. Edwards, Professor of Hebrew, Theological Seminary, Andover.

Introductory Remarks, by the Translator.

[Professor Twesten, now in the chair of theology recently filled by Schleiermacher in the university of Berlin, is one of the most distinguished evangelical theologians of Germany, though his writings are not very numerous. He was born at Glückstadt on the 11th of April, 1789. His earliest education was acquired at the Latin school of his native place; he then pursued the study of philology and theology at the university of Kiel, in Denmark, from which he received, in 1812, the honorary degree of doctor in philosophy. He then went to Berlin, where he came into particular connection with Schleiermacher from whose theological turn of mind, he received an important influence. In the same year he became a teacher of a gymnasium in Berlin, and, in 1813, inspector in a similar institution. In 1814, he left Berlin, and became professor extraordinarius of philosophy and theology at Kiel. In 1819, he became professor ordinarius of theology in the same university. In 1826, the university of Bonn gave him the degree of doctor in theology. In the same year, he received the order of knighthood, and in 1827, he was chosen a member of the philosophical society of Copenhagen. He declined several invitations to professorships from various universities, among which were Bonn and Göttingen. In 1836, on the decease of Schleiermacher, he removed to Berlin. His not very numerous publications are confined to philology, theology, and philosophy. His only publication in the first named branch is a critical commentary on Hesiod's Works and Days, Kiel, 1815. In 1818, he published a book on Symbolik, and in 1819, in conjunction with the pastor Harms of Kiel, a work on the Augsburg Confession, in German and Latin. He showed himself to be a clear and profound thinker by his Logic, printed at Sleswig in 1825. In 1826, he published an account of the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa. From 1815 to 1819, he was

an active contributor to a periodical at Kiel ("Kieler Blätter). In addition to his literary labors and his services as an academical teacher, he was quite efficient as a member of society at Kiel, particularly in the concerns of the poor, in which he showed an uncommon practical talent.

His principal publication in theology, unquestionably, is his *Lectures on Dogmatic*, (*Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik*), published at Hamburg in 1826. Only one volume has yet appeared. The third edition of this volume was published in 1834, in the preface to which we have the promise of an early appearance of the first part of the second volume. The contents of the first volume are, I. A general Introduction, embracing, the nature of religion, the connection of knowledge with religion, the christian, the biblical and the Lutheran dogmatic, importance of the Lutheran dogmatic for theologians, closer view of its design, reference of the Lutheran creed to the Bible, relation between the Lutheran creed and those of other sects, relation of dogmatic to philosophy, and relation of dogmatic to the office of preaching in the church. II. An Historico-Critical Introduction, including a survey of the progress of Christianity to our times, Catholicism, Protestantism, review of the history of christian dogmatic — first period from Peter Lombard to Melancthon — second from Melancthon to Semler, — third from Semler to our times. Our author then proceeds to discuss the principles and character of Protestantism. The first or critical portion of the work treats of the sources of religious truth, under the subdivisions of—authority of the Holy Scriptures, connection of the Old and New Testaments, divinity of the Scriptures — revelation — inspiration, sacred canon, interpretation of the Scriptures, and the right use of reason.

A translation of the second of these subdivisions, we now present to our readers. TRANSLATOR.]

CONNECTION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Under the name of the Holy Scriptures, which we expound as the rule of theology and as the source of our knowledge of it, we include not merely the writings composed by the apostles or their disciples, which refer to the establishment of the christian religion and church — the Scriptures of the New Testament — but also the religious documents of the Jews — the

writings of the Old Testament or Covenant.* Herein we follow the authority of Christ and the apostles, who refer to the laws, precepts, ordinances, prophecies of the Old Testament, and derive their arguments from thence.† They indicate its sentiments as those of God, or of the Holy Spirit;‡ they expressly establish its validity, or recommend its use.§

Still, there is another aspect in the religious constitution of the Old Testament, which is represented in the New as imperfect, 2 Cor. 3: 6 seq., Heb. 8: 6 seq.; as the first rudiments, Gal. 4: 3, 9; as a mere preparatory or intermediate stage in religious education, which as Christians we have passed over, Gal. 3: 23, seq., and as something now antiquated and dissolved, Heb. 8: 13. 2 Cor. 3: 11. Thus the writings in question cannot come to us in the shape of a rule of faith and practice like the New Testament, and hence we have the problem, otherwise worthy of attention, to determine how we are to regard these writings from the *stand-point* of christian theology?

Since it is no other than Christ himself by whom we are delivered, not merely from sin, but from the darkness of our understanding and heart, so must we look especially to him, in order to arrive at the light of true knowledge, and then to those persons who propagated and established what he commanded—the apostles and their disciples, whose writings are contained in the New Testament. But the appearance of Christ does not stand isolated. He is the object and aim of a series of divine preparations, which point to the redemption of men. For, as the divine determination in respect to redemption and expiation must be regarded as eternal, so must its accomplishment have commenced along with the fall of man. But since every thing in the world follows the laws of its being which God would not

* The Vulgate translates the Greek *διαθήκη* by the word *testamentum*,—as though the covenant established by the Deity was intended to be in close connection with the Mosaic religious dispensation, from which the name and the idea were transferred to Christianity when the old covenant ceased. Heb. 9: 15. 12: 24. Matt. 26: 28, not without reference to Jer. 31: 31. Comp. Heb. 8: 8 seq.

† Luke 10: 26. 16: 29. 20: 37, 42. 24: 25—27, 44—47. John 5: 39, 46. Acts 2: 25—31. 28: 23,—also particularly in the epistles.

‡ Matt. 15: 4—6. Acts 3: 18, 21. 4: 25. 1 Cor. 9: 8. Heb. 1: 1. 3: 7. 10: 15. 1 Pet. 1: 10—12, etc.

§ Matt. 5: 17. Luke 16: 17. 2 Tim. 3: 14—16. 2 Pet. 1: 19.

abolish, and since the weak eyes of men cannot look directly on the divine light in its full clearness, therefore, God has brought our race through certain stages of moral and religious development, till finally the Saviour himself appeared, and the mystery of redemption in which are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, Col. 2: 3, was fully disclosed. This determines our view of the conduct of the people from whom the salvation was to proceed, John 4: 22 ; of the counsels which imparted it ; of the arrangements which were entered into in regard to it, and of the writings in which these things are recorded. Thus the exhibitions of the divine will, from which proceeded the determination respecting redemption, are ever becoming clearer ; and the wisdom by which this salvation was accomplished, has made out in the writings of the Old and New Testaments *one code* of divine revelations, which display to us the preparations made by God for our redemption from beginning to end in connection. These preparations must be so apprehended by us, that we can rightly understand the last and highest of them, and so that the coming of Christ will operate on us in the same manner as it did on his first disciples. Since Christ found his people prepared for himself by means of these holy writings, and since he had, in his own behalf, a greater witness than that of Moses and the prophets—even the testimony of God in the works which were appointed unto him to fulfil, John 5: 36, so the effects of the one are by no means to be separated from those of the others. As Christ was thenceforth preached unto the heathen, they at the same time received the writings of the Old Testament ; to these, in addition he annexed the annunciation of the gospel, and even after this had gained an entrance, it would be difficult to reckon how many were won to the faith by means of the Old Testament, or by it were confirmed ;—in respect to which many explicit testimonies both of modern and ancient times have come to us. What is so connected in contents and in effect, we may be allowed to discriminate, though not to divide. And since we are now to distinguish, and to inquire, how far the Old Testament can be regarded as the rule of faith and life for Christians, we may consider the question under two divisions.

1. The Old Testament contains divine revelations and precepts. But God can reveal nothing which is not true : he can order nothing which is not holy and good and important for those who seek information in respect to truth and goodness.

Yet every thing is not revealed at the beginning. Till man is susceptible of higher manifestations, God must condescend to his infirmity ; the divine precepts must always be adapted to man's actual progress in education, until he is ripened for a more perfect state. Hence we must compare the earlier revelations and ordinances with the later—those of the Old Testament with those of the New, and give attention to the points where the former are true and valid, where they are fully interpreted and completed, where they are modified or abolished.

In this, however, is rather contained a necessity to come to a reply to the proposed inquiry, than the answer itself. This can be stated precisely

2. In a direct and obvious canon : The information and the precepts of the Old Testament are of authority for us so far as they point to *one* and the same religion contained in the Old Testament as is contained in the New ; they are not of validity so far as the religion of the Old Testament stands in opposition to that of the New.

It is, indeed, in itself clear, that the christian life and consciousness, so far as it differs throughout from those of the pious Israelites, can draw no nourishment from that by which the latter was ordered or exhibited ; but whatever sentiment or knowledge does not contribute to advance us in the faith, to which God has called us through Christ, cannot be regarded as intended by him for us.

Now the religion of the Old and New Testament is *one* in relation to its monotheistic-dogmatic character, i. e. it is such a religion as elevates itself to the recognition of *one* true God, which lies at the foundation of the most important motives of our moral consciousness, and which, ripened into reflection, was sufficient to enable an individual, in the rejection of polytheism, to strive after the truth. We are also to bring into account the materials for the development of the religious consciousness which exist in monotheism. Also, as the code of precepts expands itself, we are to consider the subjective principle of religious earnestness and love of truth which are therein predominant. This brings us to the perpetual validity of the instructions of the Old Testament in respect to universal religious truths, the being of God, his will, works and attributes,—likewise the universal rules and precepts which are set up for the direction of men as called to act or to suffer ;—instructions and precepts which are presupposed in the New Testament, although

there illustrated in a more complete manner, and brought forward in connection with the peculiar truths of Christianity and by them more exactly defined.

Still, whatever may be these peculiarities, we are by no means to place the New Testament in opposition to the Old. The instructions and preparations of the latter are not merely introductory steps to Christianity, but contain Christianity itself in a certain sense, whatever may be their introductory character. As preliminary to what is not yet completely fulfilled, they are only that in which lies the germ, in which still, though the perfect accomplishment is not yet reached, there is a capacity in itself for further enlargement and development; and whatever is essential to religion as it were completes itself in Christianity; or, as we may further expand the idea, whatever belongs to the essential conditions of our salvation cannot be entirely wanting in a religion revealed by God. We see, indeed, in nature how the inferior forms of animal organization point to the highest — to the type of the human form. Thus the Jewish religious community differed from the Christian in its mingling with political affairs, in its reference to the particular relations and needs of this people, in its temple-service and priesthood. Still, here we find as it were a preformative influence. The religious condition of the Jews conceals under a sensible covering the essential ideas of a christian theocracy, of which Christ is to be the head. In the religious life of a pious Israelite we recognize the elements of a spirit kindred to ourselves. In short, we see Christianity in a certain sense previous to Christ.* But in order to place together in its appropriate light the real differences between the Old and New Testaments, we must anticipate a little what is in the sequel still further illustrated.

Christianity requires, that along with the consciousness of our sinfulness, of our desert of punishment, as well as of our impotence, we should embrace Christ with a full faith, in order that we may be happy and blameless in his strength, through whom God has reconciled the world unto himself, and gives unto us a higher power through which we overcome sin. Now what is peculiar to this faith is, that it leads us to Christ. Therefore, that which summons us to believe is the recognition of the divine mercy in Christ — the *gospel* in its appropriate sense as

* Or as Melancthon says: "Ever since the creation of man, there has been one and a perpetual church of God."

the means by which christian piety is produced in us,—and this is the substance of the New Testament. But faith cannot be of a superior kind without a higher development of the moral consciousness, which is indeed advanced by it, but which is presupposed to a certain degree. Now, can any one perceive the worth and greatness of the divine mercy, who is not deeply impressed with the fact that the anger and wrath of God are directed against us on account of our sins, who does not acknowledge with deep pain the greatness of his guilt? How can one seek for higher aid, who has not learned by experience that he cannot help himself? Indeed, would not faith in redemption, instead of giving consolation to the sorrowful and despairing, rather afford aid to the thoughtless, and be a sort of offset to man for his imperfections, while he is a stranger to the anguish of a terrified conscience and to true repentance? Hence the gospel first exerts a saving influence when man has been brought through another school—the school of the *law*, which places before him the strictness of the divine command and the severity of the divine justice. This for the Israelites was the school of the Mosaic, divine economy—the cardinal idea of the Old Testament.

Still, God did not permit them to want revelations of mercy and grace, though in a great degree in the form and under the shadow of the law. Yet, this legal, sacred economy with its ceremonies and observances was arranged, not merely that through these external means, a revelation of God might be maintained and that purity preserved which he requires of his people, but also in order that the repentant sinner might be led to him to seek through him freedom from guilt and pollution—the emblem of the greater sacrifice which was afterwards to be offered up for the sins of the world. It was under the shadow of the law;—so that the posterity of Abraham, being held together by a covenant embracing political and religious regulations, might not only retain a belief in the true God, while religion degenerated and became disfigured by the general prevalence of idolatry, but also that a prospect might be kept open towards the more perfect revelation, and that circumstances might be in readiness for the Redeemer to commence his benevolent labors. Under the protecting shadow of the law, the germ of faith in the divine mercy was preserved and developed itself—a faith, indeed, which from the beginning had not reference merely to the existing time, but extended into futurity,

and gradually passing over the limits of the law, and evermore forming itself in such a manner so that in the end nothing was wanting to bring the true Israelite to Christ, but the joyful *εὐφρόνη-
σαμεν*, John 1 : 42, 46.

Promises had been made to the patriarchs besides those which received their accomplishment during the lives of their descendants. Moses had given the sustaining hope of higher revelations to such as might be anxiously waiting for them, when he referred the people to a prophet who should come after him. The ideal image of a theocratic king which hovered before the vision of the holy songsters in their hymns, was of a loftier kind than could be realized in David or Solomon. Still less could circumstances, as they presented themselves in the following period of degeneracy and degradation, satisfy the earnest, longing mind of the pious and wise among the people. The harder the fortunes were which pressed upon them, the firmer and more trustingly they fastened on a condition of things delineated in prophecy, where God, having forgiven his people, would send them a Saviour, not merely from external oppression and poverty, but also from their religious and moral degeneracy ;—not simply to restore the ancient religion in its purity, but to establish a new covenant, his Spirit being poured out upon all, and all nations being led to know him. These prophetic delineations are such that we are led to the conclusion, that even when the prophets had in their minds persons or events of their own times, the Spirit which was in them, 1 Pet. 1 : 11, intended and foretold something different. This longing hope for a future salvation, this dwelling on the image of a perfect theocracy, which found constantly new nourishment in the predictions of the Old Testament, and which could be shaken by no mistake respecting the true time, (a mistake which has been noticed as not uncommon in respect to human nature,) while it did not remain free from impure mixtures, still maintained its foundations in truth. This has always remained a peculiarity in the Jewish people ; a trait in the highest degree remarkable, which, as it appears to us, must lead them sooner or later from Moses on to Christ.

We thus find announced in the Old Testament, not merely the divine mercy in general, but mercy in its reference to a future, more perfect revelation of the same as it appeared in Christ ; and also the idea, which could not feel itself to be satisfied in the existing religious constitution, but which hoped for

a new covenant, and for that higher development of the divine kingdom which followed in Christ,—intimated indeed in the precepts of the law, and which was unveiled more clearly in the promises of the prophets. So far we can say that the religion of the Old and New Testaments is the same in its true substance ; not only in relation to its origin, (as we trace both back to divine revelations), but in reference to its object—the Messiah to whom the Old Testament points—when not directly yet mediately. They differ in relation to this point, only as the Old Testament points to one who is to come ; the New, makes known one who has already appeared, (though not without reference to another period still future, 1 Cor. 11: 26. The one, indeed, contained the principal lineaments of the idea, but the actual appearance (the humanity of Christ, the Mediator) could be anticipated only by significant images, while, on the contrary, the other places him before our eyes, as he dwelt among us full of grace and truth, John 1: 14. Hence the New Testament is truly the key of the Old, and must open for us, (as Christ did once for the apostles Luke 24: 27,) the idea of its true contents. Still, however, to the enlightened mind, which knows to what object all things tend, the Old Testament will ever be able, as in the case of Timothy, 2 Tim. 3: 15, to make wise unto salvation, not by works of the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ.

But in as far as the Old Testament is particularly an inculcation of the law, so far we may say, its religion is in contrast to that of the New Testament. As Christians we are not under the law, but under grace, Rom. 6: 14,—yet not as if Christ did not demand what is essential in the law, Matt. 7: 12. 22: 40. Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it, Matt. 5: 17 ; yea, the righteousness of Christians must be more perfect than that of the Pharisees, Matt. 5: 20, who observed the law in the strictest manner, Acts 26: 5. But Christianity demands a disposition which is not meant to be able to work out its own righteousness by the deeds of the law, (a fundamental mistake of the Jews, Rom. 10: 3), but to receive by faith the righteousness of Christ, in like manner as Paul, Phil. 3: 9,—and which requires that it be done with inward freedom, without the letter of the law, which the law aspired after, and which, accompanied by threatenings of Divine punishment, prescribes in external methods, what we have to do and to suffer. Where this is still wanting, there is no true Christianity ; there still, the opposing lust of the flesh predominates over the spirit, and not

the spirit over the flesh, while the latter from the first gradually frees us from sin and from the law, Gal. 5: 17, 18, 22. And, indeed, for him who has not yet come to the point where the most earnest language of the law has a salutary effect, as well as the alluring voice of the gospel,* a part of the law has lost its validity; its destination has become *merely* preparatory,—partly political, which must have given to the Jewish theocracy an external support till the Author and Head of the true christian theocracy appeared,—and partly ritual, which could only preserve the need of redemption and expiation, until he came who could alone satisfy that need. In reference hereto, Christ is, with peculiar propriety, named, not only the object, but the end of the law, Rom. 10: 4. So then who among us has occasion for the law as a schoolmaster and a tutor, Gal. 4: 24. 5: 2? He does not aspire after the freedom of the children of God, who has already found it in the christian church, which ceases not to make known the righteousness and mercy of God, not merely through the preaching of the divine word, but in its very existence and through its entire manifestation.

Thus we may now easily see, how far the Old Testament can be yet for us a rule of faith and life. We here speak, not of its worth in respect to a learned acquaintance with the history of religion, or for a learned commentary on the New Testament, (its historical and hermeneutical use, although this has an important aspect, not merely for learned men, but for every Christian). We speak especially of its value for religion itself, in so far as it can always secure for us an incitement to pious feeling, as awakening those dispositions on which depend the fear of God, love, confidence, self-knowledge, faith, obedience, and as it respects the desire to seek for information concerning God, his mercy and righteousness, his law and promises. This is its doctrinal and moral use. Then, indeed, we ought always to recollect that the special object of the New Testament is not to make known to us the law, but the gospel, not in dark images and predictions, but in the clear light of actual fulfilment. There is present with us one who is greater than the lawgiver, or the priests, the kings and prophets of the Old Testament, Luke 10: 24. 11: 31, 32. Heb. iii. and vii., through whom mercy and truth have come, John 1: 17, from whose fulness, a living

* So the Lutheran Catechism* rightly places the ten commandments before faith.

fountain of new life and of higher knowledge streams forth on those who believe upon him, John 7: 38. It is not, simply, however, that there is a revelation of the hitherto concealed and secret mysteries of the divine counsels, Rom. 16: 25. Eph. 3: 15., but also that the covering was removed away from those things, which even to the prophets themselves, who predicted the grace that was to come, was rather a point for investigation and search than a clear vision, 1 Pet. 1: 10. It is now settled not only in relation to that which is old and abolished, but also in what manner that is to be understood which contains profounder and more permanent truth. It cannot therefore be doubted that there is in the New Testament a far more perfect *norm* and source of christian knowledge, than in the Old. The one is an original fountain, the other a secondary one.* We would as little over-estimate the latter, on the one hand, by drawing from it alone the whole system of christian faith, † as, on the other hand, unite in undervaluing it, in which extreme we find some of the Gnostics, who went so far as to ascribe to it a wholly different design from the revelations which were made by Christ;—consequently on the ground, that though the Old Testament had a divine origin, yet it was limited (according to the opinions of the anabaptists and some other modern sects) to things merely earthly and sensual—to the exclusion of a spiritual germ. This view is in opposition to Christ and his apostles, with whom the *λύσαι* was ever the *πληροῖσαι*; the *καταργῆσαι* was always placed in connection with the *συνῆσαι*, Rom. 3: 31. The effect has been to obstruct the right interpretation of the New Testament.

Of the former error—a one-sided, over-estimate of the Old Testament, we can by no means acquit our older theologians, either as it regards their view of the Old Testament in general, or their handling of particular passages. It was not enough to find the germ of the peculiar laws of Christianity in the Old Testament; the entire delineation must be discovered. It was not simply concluded, that we must find a general reference to Christ, but also that futurity was clearly revealed to the pious

* With this readily agrees Schleiermacher's *Ansicht von der normalen dignität des Alten Testaments*, *Darstell. des Gla.* § 150 *Zusatz*.

† As was attempted to be done on the broadest scale by John Wigand and Matth. Judex in their *Syntagma* or *Corpus doctrinae ex V. T. tantum collectum, dispositum et concinnatum*, Basil. 1564. Particular examples may be found in the older systems.

men among the Israelites. Even the reformers, who so beautifully developed the contrast between the law and the gospel, were not always sufficiently guarded on this point. To such views must they be led, who accommodate themselves to what are often arbitrary and fanciful modes of interpretation ;—where, without regard to the context, a forced interpretation is at once given to the letter ; very remote resemblances, to the prejudice of the natural meaning of the word, are valued, and the truth which lies at the ground of the typical and prophetic meaning, is so disfigured, that the principle must always occasion mistakes in the application. When now, on the other hand, a contradiction is assumed, partly by entire sects, e. g. the Arminians and Socinians, and partly by particular individuals of our church, e. g. Calixtus ; when these contradictions are drawn out into particulars, because individual doctrines, e. g. that of the trinity, cannot be found explicitly announced in the Old Testament ; even when the belief of the pious men in the Old Testament is declared to be only a belief indirectly in Christ ;—we cannot indeed, approve of every thing which lies at the foundation of such expressions as the foregoing, or which is introduced in connection with them,—yet neither can we entirely throw them aside, as the older theologians did. We cannot truly charge those who advance them with intentional unfairness, while they employ the historical mode of interpretation in opposition to a pseudo-dogmatic—while they follow out the principle, that, in connection with the application of generally received hermeneutical rules, one must seek to investigate what the writers themselves intended, as they were understood by their contemporaries, without daring to introduce any later views or notions. We censure such modes of interpretation only as would destroy the most undeniable connection between the Old and New Testaments, which recognizes in the former nothing of a higher character, and which willingly allows the most violent mode of proceeding, ere it will concede any references to Christ,—while it maintains that the New Testament is so essentially different from the Old.

The error of the older theologians, we would avoid, inasmuch as we do not directly maintain that the religion of the Old Testament is identical with that of the New, or that its writings, like those of the New, treat altogether of Christ ; but this identity appears only so far as it [the Old Testament] is the *norm* and the source of religious truth for us.

We thus throw no obstacle in the way of the historical interpretation, but merely place it, (without determining at the outset its extent,) on the principles of the New Testament, — the christian interpretation; — in the position which we are fully ready to justify. Here, especially, we must not consider merely what circumstances are in favor of a particular position, but how they bear upon and stand related to another — the *teleological* method of considering the subject. Now, as little as the naturalist allows himself to be satisfied, when he regards plants and animals merely from that point of view in which they promote the convenience or luxury of men, so little will a sound understanding allow itself to be persuaded, that a final end is only an accidental result of a process, without any intention being aimed at by the Author of nature. The natural philosopher knows well, that the higher formations in the series of organized development are from the lower, so that the one casts light on the other, and that it is certain, that the right means have not been employed for understanding the natural history of an organ, when it has been considered separate from its earlier condition, and no investigation has been had into its previous state. Even so no reflecting man will object, when we assert that the fundamental ideas and objections which are found in the dogmas and contests of philosophers (e. g. one may remember the controversy respecting innate ideas) are the same which occupy ourselves, although we are considerably advanced in the knowledge of their meaning, and in the modes of expressing them. Why then in the writings of divinely inspired lawgivers and prophets, should we dare to see only what the lexicons and grammars spell out from words? Long and rightfully has the important idea been inculcated, that the books of the Bible are to be read as we read other writings. Must we on that account wholly forget, that they are divine writings?

Finally, the inquiry concerning the Connection between the Old and New Testaments, (which has been handled, to a wide extent, and in many controversies, the true grounds of which by no means lie where the words employed would seem to imply,) has been so developed, that we must here satisfy ourselves, to have indicated the principal point, in the critical examination of the Old Testament Scriptures in their relation to the christian church. We cannot here introduce the marked difference, asserted by Paul, Gal. 3: 15 seq., between the Abrahamic covenant and that of Moses, and their relations with each other and

with that of Christ, though this would be a subject not unimportant in itself, nor in its bearing on the controversies of both the Protestant sects, [the Calvinists and the Lutherans]. One thing, however, will demand in the sequel a fuller examination — the value of the Old Testament will naturally claim particular consideration, not merely that we may consider the subjects of revelation and of inspiration, but also that we may know *how* to consider them.

ARTICLE XII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

- 1.—*The Union Bible Dictionary. Prepared for the American Sunday School Union, and revised by the Committee of Publication.* Philadelphia : A. S. S. Union, 1837. pp. 648.

It would not be easy to specify any more hopeful symptom at the present day than the spirit of biblical research which has sprung up along with the progress of Sunday School and Bible Class instruction. Neither teacher nor pupil now feels it to be enough merely to master the *letter* of the sacred volume, or to become familiar with the popular and common-place explanations of its text. The Scriptures are beginning to be *searched* and their hidden riches to be exposed and brought to the light. Every thing which can tend to put the reader in more perfect possession of the exact mind of the Spirit in his word is laid under tribute. Criticism, parallelism, antiquities, travels, topography, eastern manners, customs, costumes, idioms, scenery — in fine, the whole range of oriental illustration is now drawn upon in order to remove the obscurities of holy writ, and make what is plain plainer. The wants which have been made to be felt in consequence of this growing spirit of investigation have already been met to a considerable degree, and it is gratifying to know that so many of the ablest pens in our country are devoted to this service. That such is the case we have fresh evidence in the very valuable little volume here presented to the public by that institution which has done so much to foster this spirit, as well as to minister to its gratification. The 'Union Bible Dictionary' needs only the passport of its own merits to secure it at once a high place in the estimation of every student of the Bible.

This work, though comprising all the most valuable portions of

the Dictionary connected and improved by the editorial labors of the Rev. Dr. Alexander, has still received such essential additions and modifications as to render it in fact a strictly original work ; one in which a leading design has been throughout to adapt it most fully to the present improved state of biblical science. In connection with this, the object has been to make it so to correspond in principle, character, and uses with the other publications of the Society, that the whole shall form together a kind of complete Biblical Cyclopaedia.

From a thorough examination of the entire volume we feel prepared to say that it is a most successful attempt to supply the various desiderata in all former works of the same kind, nor could we easily point out a volume of the same compass which embodies a larger amount of valuable information selected with more judgment or digested in better order. Far from being a mere dictionary of proper names adapted to the biography or geography of the Bible, it contains a condensed, but extremely satisfactory, summary of explanations upon all the leading terms and subjects which naturally excite inquiry in the mind of an attentive reader of the Scriptures.

The prominent excellencies which have struck us in the perusal of the 'Union Dictionary' are (1) The judgment, tact, and discrimination displayed in the *matter* brought together under the different articles, and the neat simplicity with which it is expressed. On an inspection of the whole, the epithet *judicious* would perhaps best convey the impression produced upon the mind of the intelligent reader. Nothing is wanting, nothing superfluous ; just that is said, for the most part, under every head, which it was important should be said, and nothing more. And while the most *rigid accuracy of definition* has evidently been studied in every page, an equally anxious and successful effort is visible to clothe the whole in a style of perspicuity that shall adapt it to the comprehension of every grade of intellect. (2) The air of *freshness* and of manifest *authenticity* which is imparted to the illustrations drawn from the journals of missionaries and travellers to the East. In this department while nearly every thing is *new*, it is yet so *pertinent*, that it is not easy to describe the interest and relish with which it is pursued. (3) The amount of pictorial illustration and its peculiarly *authentic* character. The work abounds with plates handsomely executed and evidently drawn from the very best sources. In contemplating them the mind feels an inward assurance that they are not mere fancy sketches, but the most faithful representations which could be obtained. It is evident that great pains and great expense have been incurred in this department, but both have been well laid out.—It would be easy to specify other points of excellence which characterize this volume, but we conclude our very earnest recommendation of it by advertising to its freedom from sectarian peculiarities and the great care

and accuracy with which it has been brought out. The services of the most distinguished biblical scholars in the country, the committee say, have been employed in a general revision of it, while many of its most important articles have been subjected to a critical examination in other quarters. At the low price of 75 cts. per copy an extensive sale alone can repay the labor and cost bestowed upon it, and that it is abundantly entitled to such a circulation, we have no hesitation in affirming.

2.—WORKS OF HENRY HALLAM.

Introduction to the Literature of Europe, in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries. By Henry Hallam, F. R. A. S., Corresponding member of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences in the French Institute. London: John Murray, 1837. Vol. I. pp. 659.

View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages, by Henry Hallam. From the sixth London Edition, complete in one volume. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1837. pp. 568.

Mr. Hallam has been long and favorably known as a writer on both sides of the Atlantic. His view of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages has been published in six editions in England and two in this country. His Constitutional History of England from the accession of Henry VII. to the death of George II., in some respects a continuation of the History of the Middle Ages, has been issued in three English editions and in one or two American. We do not know, that Mr. H. has published any other works, except papers for periodical publications, etc. He is a member of the committee of Lord Brougham's Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, and accords, we suppose, with that distinguished man in politics.

Of the Literary Introduction the author says: "Some departments of literature are passed over, or partially touched. Among the former are books relating to particular arts, as agriculture or painting, or subjects of merely local interest, as those of English laws; among the latter is the great and extensive portion of every library, the historical. Unless where history has been written with peculiar beauty of language, or philosophical spirit, I have generally omitted all mention of it." The principal authorities that the author mentions are the *Bibliotheca Universalis*, and the *Pandectae Universales* of Conrad Gesner; the *Bibliotheca Selecta* of Possevin; Fabricius's edition of the *Polyhistor* of Morhof; the *Origine Progresso e Stato attuale d'ogni Letteratura* of Andrés, a Spanish Jesuit, characterized as an extraordinary performance; the *History of Literature*, a plan undertaken in Germany, (but a small part of which has been completed), under the general direction of Eichhorn,—in which Bou-

terwek had the department of poetry and polite letters, Sprengel of anatomy and medicine, Kästner of the mathematical sciences, Buhle of speculative philosophy, and Heeren of classical philology; Eichhorn's History of Literature in six volumes; the works of Tiraboschi, Corniani and Ginguéné, on Italian literature; Warton's History of English Poetry; the philosophical works of Brucker and Tennemann; the French works of Montucla, Portal, Bayle, Niceron, and the Biographie Universelle; Chalmers's English Biographical Dictionary, etc.

The first chapter of the work is on the general state of literature in the Middle Ages to the end of the 14th century. The last of the ancients, and one who forms a link between the classical period of literature and that of the Middle Ages, in which he was a favorite author, was Boethius, a man of fine genius, whose Consolation of Philosophy was written in prison, shortly before his death. Thenceforward the downfall of learning and eloquence was inconceivably rapid. A state of general ignorance lasted about five centuries. A slender but living stream, however, kept flowing on in the worst times. Guizot and Hallam agree in the opinion that the seventh century is the *nadir* of the human mind in Europe. Its movement in advance began in the 8th century, with Charlemagne. England soon furnished names of considerable importance in Theodore, Bede, and Alcuin. Cathedral and conventual schools were created or restored by Charlemagne, which produced happy fruits under his successors. It is the most striking circumstance in the literary annals of the Middle Ages, that they are more deficient in native genius than in acquired ability. There was a tameness, a mediocrity, a servile habit of copying from others. Only two extraordinary men stand out from the crowd in literature and philosophy—Scotus Eriгена and Gerbert. At the beginning of the 12th century, we enter on a new division in the literary history of Europe. The most important circumstances which tended to arouse Europe from her lethargy were the institutions of universities, and the methods pursued in them; the cultivation of the modern languages, followed by the multiplication of books, and the extension of the art of writing; the investigation of the Roman law; and the return to the study of the Latin language in its purity. Collegiate foundations in universities seem to have been derived from the Saracens. At the year 1400, we find a national literature subsisting in seven European languages, three spoken in the Spanish peninsula, the French, the Italian, the German, and the English. The 14th century was not in the slightest degree superior to the preceding age in respect to classical studies. The first real restorer of polite letters was Petrarch.

Mr. Hallam, in his second chapter, treats of the literature of Europe from 1400 to 1440. The latter of these periods is nearly coincident with the complete development of an ardent thirst for classi-

cal, especially Grecian, literature in Italy, as the year 1400 was with its first manifestation. There are vestiges much earlier than 1400 of the study of Greek literature. But its decided revival cannot be placed before 1395, when Chrysoloras established himself at Florence as public teacher of Greek. He had some eminent disciples. The principal Italian cities became more wealthy after 1350. Books were cheaper than in other parts of Europe. In Milan, about 1300, there were fifty persons who lived by copying them. At Bologna also, it was a regular occupation at fixed prices. Albertus Magnus, whose collected works were published at Lyons, in 1651, in twenty-one folio volumes, may pass for the most fertile writer in the world. Upon the three columns,—chivalry, gallantry, and religion,—says Hallam, repose the fictions of the middle ages. In the first part of the 15th century, we find three distinct currents of religious opinion, the high pretensions of the Roman church to a sort of moral, as well as theological infallibility, and to a paramount authority even in temporal affairs; second, the councils of Constance and Basle and the contentions of the Gallican and German churches against the encroachments of the holy see, had raised up a strong adverse party; third, the avowed heretics, such as the disciples of Wiclif and Huss. Thomas à Kempis's *De Imitatione Christi* is said to have gone through 1800 editions, and to have been read, probably, more than any work after the Scriptures.

The third chapter embraces the literature of Europe from 1440 to 1500. About 1450, Laurentius Valla gives us the earliest specimens of explanations of the New Testament founded on the original languages of Scripture. The capture of Constantinople, in 1453, drove a few learned Greeks to hospitable Italy. About the end of the 14th century, impressions were taken from engraved blocks of wood, sometimes for playing cards, which came into use not long before that time; sometimes for rude cuts of saints. Gradually entire pages were impressed in this manner, and thus began what are called block-books, printed in fixed characters, but never exceeding a very few leaves. The earliest book printed from the movable types of Gutenberg is generally believed to be the Latin Bible, commonly called the Mazarin Bible. This appears to have been executed in 1455. An almanac for 1457 has been detected. From 1470 to 1480, 1297 books were printed in Italy, of which 234 are editions of ancient classics. The first Hebrew book, Jarchi's Commentary on the Pentateuch, was printed in Italy in 1475. The whole Hebrew Bible was printed in Soncino in 1488. Several distinguished men now arose such as Politian, Picus of Mirandola, Reuchlin and Lionardo da Vinci. Erasmus and Budaeus were now devoting incessant labor to the acquisition of the Greek language. Erasmus's *Adages*, printed at Basle in 1500, was doubtless the chief prose work of the century beyond the limits of Italy. It is certain

that much more than ten thousand editions of books or pamphlets were printed from 1470 to 1500. More than half of the number appeared in Italy. The price of books was diminished by four fifths after the invention of printing.

The fourth chapter treats of the literature of Europe from 1500 to 1520. Leo X. became pope in 1513. He began by placing men of letters in the most honorable stations of his court. There were two, Bembo and Sadolet, who had by common consent reached a consummate elegance of style. The personal taste of Leo was almost entirely directed towards poetry and the beauties of style. We owe to him the publication of the first five books of the *Annals* of Tacitus. In 1514, above 100 professors received salaries in the Roman university or gymnasium. Erasmus diffuses a lustre over his age, which no other name among the learned supplies. His Greek Testament was published in 1516. More's *Utopia* was the only work of genius furnished by England in this age.

In treating of the Reformation, Mr. Hallam, as it seems to us, does great injustice to Luther: "The doctrines of Luther," he remarks, "taken altogether, are not more rational, that is, more conformable to what men, *a priori*, would expect to find in religion, than those of the church of Rome; nor did he ever pretend that they were so. As to the privilege of free inquiry, it was of course exercised by those who deserted their ancient altars, but certainly not upon any latitudinarian theory of a right to judge amiss. Nor again, is there any foundation for imagining that Luther was concerned for the interests of literature. None had he himself, save theological; nor are there, as I apprehend, many allusions to profane studies, or any proof of his regard to them, in all his works. On the contrary, it is probable that both the principles of this great founder of the Reformation, and the natural tendency of so intense an application to theological controversy, checked for a time the progress of philological and philosophical literature on this side the Alps." Again: "In the history of the Reformation, Luther is incomparably the greatest name. We see him, in the skilful composition of Robertson, the chief figure of a groupe of gownsmen, standing in contrast on the canvass with the crowned rivals of France and Austria, and their attendant warriors, but blended in the unity of that historic picture. This amazing influence on the revolutions of his own age, and on the opinions of mankind, seems to have produced, as is not unnatural, an exaggerated notion of his intellectual greatness. It is admitted on all sides, that he wrote his own language with force and purity; and he is reckoned one of its best models. The hymns in use with the Lutheran church, many of which are his own, possess a simple dignity and devoutness, never, probably, excelled in that class of poetry. But from the Latin works of Luther few readers, I believe, will rise without disappoint-

ment. Their intemperance, their coarseness, their inelegance, their scurrility, their wild paradoxes, that menace the foundations of religious morality, are not compensated, so far at least as my slight acquaintance with them extends, by much strength or acuteness, and still less by any impressive eloquence." "The total want of self-restraint [in Luther], with the intoxicating effects of presumptuousness, is sufficient to account for aberrations, which men of regular minds construe into actual madness."

These extraordinary statements of Hallam are in keeping with remarks in his previous works. In his anxiety to avoid the partizanship, as he describes it, of such men as Isaac Milner, he falls, as it seems to us, into the opposite extreme. Luther comes out from his hands shorn of nearly all his honors, an ignorant, furious, exacerbad monk, who, if he could have had his way, would have involved the world in a Protestant midnight. But Hallam's statements seem to be a little inconsistent with themselves. Luther wrote and spoke German with great perfection. He composed numerous excellent hymns, which is certainly a rare gift. He made a most excellent translation, as all acknowledge, of the Bible from the original Hebrew and Greek into German—a translation which is to German literature what our authorized translation is to English—a standard of the tongue. Surely Luther must have had some philology, some common sense, some judgment, to have made a translation, with the slight helps which he had, which created a language, and whose merit is fully acknowledged by such writers as the Roman Catholic, Frederic Schlegel. That Luther was an opponent of the study of the Greek and Latin profane writers is news to us. Hallam appears to receive all the splenetic remarks of Erasmus as indubitable proof. Erasmus with all his learning and wit, had more sympathy, we fear, with Horace than with Paul, and, in his latter days, is one of the last sources to which we should apply for correct information in regard to Luther. In another passage, Hallam speaks of Luther as one whose "soul was penetrated with a fervent piety, and whose integrity as well as purity of life are unquestioned." Again, he writes of the total absence in him of self-restraint, which it would be difficult to reconcile with fervent piety. We have been accustomed to regard self-government as one of the most important parts of eminent piety. Hallam gives a wholesale opinion of Luther's Latin works, while he confesses that he has but a *slight* acquaintance with them. Hundreds of passages in those works have impressive eloquence, if they have nothing else. "The best authorities," says Hallam, "for the early history of the Reformation are Seckendorf Hist. Lutheranismi, and Sleidan Hist. de la Réformation, in Courayer's French translation." Hallam makes no allusion to the great work of J. G. Planck, incomparably the best work on the Protestant side, and very candid and impartial also. "From Luther's German

translation, and from the Latin Vulgate, the English one of Tyndale and Coverdale, published in 1535 or 1536, is avowedly taken." On the contrary there is satisfactory proof that Tyndale translated from the original Greek and Hebrew. How far Coverdale was acquainted with Hebrew does not appear.

The fifth chapter of the work before us treats of the history of ancient literature in Europe from 1520 to 1550. The labors of Sadolet, Bembo, Erasmus, Budaeus, Camerarius, Gesner and others, are passed briefly in review. The sixth chapter is occupied with the theological literature which we have partly anticipated in our notice of Luther. Of the Colloquies of Erasmus, which had an important bearing on the Reformation, 24,000 copies were sold in a single year. Reference is here had to the Institutes of Calvin, to the Loci Communes of Melancthon, the sermons of Latimer, etc. "It may not" says the author, "be invidious to surmise, that Luther and Melancthon serve little other purpose, at least in England, than to give an occasional air of erudition to a theological paragraph, or to supply its margin with a reference that few readers will verify." We know not but that such is the case in England. We should infer it from the ignorance of our author himself on the subject, but the remark does not hold good on the continent nor in the United States. The whole works of Luther are frequently imported into this country. Large editions of his Commentary on the Galatians have been published. A new and complete edition of Melancthon is now coming out in Germany under the charge of Bretschneider. Three editions of Calvin's Commentaries on the New Testament have been sold in Germany and this country within six or eight years. Even in England, within two years past, an edition of Calvin on Romans, and of Luther on Galatians has been printed.

The seventh chapter contains the history of speculative, moral and political philosophy, and of jurisprudence, in Europe, from 1520 to 1550. In speculative philosophy, we have Paracelsus, Agrippa, and Jerome Cardan; in political and moral philosophy, Calvin, Melancthon, Erasmus, Thomas Elyot, Cortegiano and especially Nicolas Machiavel. Hallam's estimate of Machiavel is very able and discriminating. Machiavel's Discourses may now be read with great advantage, especially as the course of civil society tends further towards democracy. His works must, however, be read with large deductions. His History of Florence is enough to immortalize his name.

The eighth chapter contains the history of the literature of taste; and the ninth, of scientific and miscellaneous literature in Europe from 1520 to 1550. Though these chapters contain, like other parts of the volume, many interesting facts, and not a few profound observations, yet our limits preclude any further quotation or reference.

We will only remark, that the edition of the Middle Ages by the Harpers, is brought out in excellent taste, and makes one very con-

venient and portable volume. It contains what is not common in these days, a very full index.

3.—*The Christian Professor, addressed in a series of Counsels and Cautions to the Members of Christian Churches.* By John Angell James. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1838. pp. 333.

The Rev. John Angell James of Birmingham has been too long before the American public as the author of the *Sunday School Teachers' Guide*, the *Church Members' Guide*, the *Family Monitor*, etc., and is too extensively known as the friend and correspondent of several eminent clergymen and others in this country, to need commendation to the favorable regards of our readers. The lively interest which he has ever manifested in the advancement of religion in the United States, as well as the influence of his writings in promoting it, has taught us to regard him as one of ourselves. While he is admired as a pious, judicious and instructive writer, he is also hailed as a brother, throughout our churches, and each new production from his pen is received by many with the confidence and ardor of a confirmed and intense christian affection. The publication of the "*Christian Professor*," is happily adapted to widen the sphere of this affectionate regard for the author and his works.

The substance of this "*series of Counsels and Cautions*," as the author states in his preface, was delivered in a course of sermons addressed to the church of which he is pastor. This book is designed as a sequel to the "*Church Members' Guide*," and treats of the practical rather than the private, experimental and doctrinal parts of religion; though these are distinctly exhibited and insisted on, as essential, not only to true piety, but to the acceptable profession of it. Yet the design of the author is to "contemplate the believer rather as a professor, than a Christian, or at least rather as a Christian in relation to the church and to the world, than in his individual capacity, or in his retirements."

The work is divided into *nineteen chapters*, embracing the following topics:

What the christian profession imports.—The obligation and design of the christian profession.—The dangers of self-deception.—The young professor.—An attempt to compare the present generation of professors with others that have preceded them.—The necessity and importance of professors not being satisfied with low degrees of piety, and of their seeking to attain to eminence.—The duty of professors to avoid the appearance of evil.—On conformity to the world.—On the conduct of professors in reference to politics.—On brotherly love.—The influence of professors.—Conduct of professors towards unconverted relatives.—The unmarried professor.—The professor in

prosperity.—The professor in adversity.—The conduct of professors away from home.—The backsliding professor.—On the necessity of the Holy Spirit's influence to sustain the christian professor.—The dying professor.

We have read most of these chapters with great satisfaction, and cordially recommend the book to American readers. Though the author had in his eye the professors of Christianity in another nation, and wrote for their benefit especially, his Counsels and Cautions and even his descriptions of the present generation of professors, are equally applicable to those of our own country. He does honor to several of our own authors by quoting them in confirmation or illustration of the sentiments he inculcates. Among these are an admirable "address to persons on their joining the church contained in a manual used in one of the Presbyterian churches in America," the excellent "advice" given by Edwards "to a young lady who had just commenced the life of faith," and portions of a sermon by the Rev. Albert Barnes of Philadelphia on "the rule of Christianity in regard to conformity to the world," which has been republished in England.

The sentiments of this little volume are evangelical. Some passages of it are eloquent, and highly attractive.

4.—*Outlines of a history of the Court of Rome and of the Temporal Power of the Popes. Translated from the French.* Philadelphia: Joseph Whetham, 1837. pp. 328.

This book is executed in a manner which is creditable to the publisher. In its bearings upon the Catholic controversy in this country both ecclesiastical and political, it is a timely and important publication. It is divided into thirteen chapters, the running titles of which are, "The origin of the temporal power of the popes."—"Enterprises of the popes of the ninth century."—"The tenth century."—"Enterprises of the popes of the eleventh century."—"Quarrels between the popes and the sovereigns of the twelfth century."—"The power of the popes of the thirteenth century."—"The fourteenth century."—"The fifteenth century."—"Policy of the popes of the sixteenth century."—"The attempts of the popes of the seventeenth century."—"The eighteenth century."—"Recapitulation."—"The conduct of the court of Rome since the year 1800."

The first French edition of the work was published in 1810. The last chapter, (on the conduct of the court of Rome since 1800,) was not added until the fourth edition, which was published in 1818. To this also was appended a "Chronological Table of the popes" from St. Peter in the first century, which is continued, in the American edition, to the election of Gregory XVI., in 1831. This table throws some light upon several of the details of the work, and is a valuable appendage.

This work, though published anonymously, is asserted to be the production of M. Daunou. M. Dupin, recently a member of the French ministry, calls it a historical work of the first order, and gives it a place in his "BIBLIOTHEQUE CHOISIE des liures de droit qu'il est le plus utile d'acquérir et de connaître."

We extract the following from the able and interesting preface to the edition now before us.

"The author composed this work, (which he modestly calls an essay,) under peculiar advantages. The Archives of the Vatican, which had been removed to Paris, were in his custody, at the time, by order of the government, (says M. Dupin,) and subject to his inspection. He appears to have been elaborate in research and judicious in the selection of his authorities. He is clear and methodical in the arrangement of facts, philosophical and profound in his views and spirited in his composition. His purpose in composing it was to prove that the temporal power of the Roman pontiffs originated in fraud and usurpation; that its influence upon their pastoral ministry has been to mar and degrade it; that its continuance is dangerous to the peace and liberties of Europe; and that its constant influence and effects are to retard the advancement of civilization and knowledge. Among the documents upon which he relies are many which, he says, had never before been published.

"In treating the subject, M. Daunou very naturally gives prominence to those passages in the history of the court of Rome which are particularly connected with the affairs of his own country. The liberties of the Gallican church and the quarrels which have occurred between the kings of France and the Roman pontiffs, on account of those liberties, are set forth with considerable detail."

It should be remarked, however, that the author has, in some instances, traced with minuteness the policy and conduct of the court of Rome towards other countries, and the effects of that policy.

It adds greatly to the value of this work that the author is decidedly a Roman Catholic, and that, while he deprecates the temporal power of the popes, he not only admits but positively asserts their supremacy in all things purely spiritual, and the claims of the Roman Catholic church to determine authoritatively all matters of faith. In the latter particular he differs from Gibbon in his "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," and from Hallam, in his "View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages." Differing from the above authors, as M. Daunou does, in regard to the spiritual supremacy of the Roman pontiffs, his agreement with them in other matters of fact and opinion may be deemed a mutual confirmation, and a disagreement between them, a reason for further investigation.

On the whole, this book comes to us with high authority and we regard it as well adapted to the instruction of American readers. It

teaches lessons of wisdom in regard to the assumptions of ecclesiastical power in matters of faith, which will not fail to be appreciated by the members of the protestant churches in this country, and our statesmen and those who aspire to become such may here obtain enlightened and definite views of that court which was the founder, and has been the principal teacher of European diplomacy.

It is also well remarked by the American editor, that "the sentiments of the author, upon the important topics of this book, are not unworthy of the attention of the Roman Catholic citizens of the United States.

"For a long period these topics have attracted the attention of the politicians as well as the clergy of France. Several works have been published in that country, relative to the temporal power of the popes, among which a small volume entitled "*Origine, progres, et limites de la puissance des popes*," etc. (Paris 1821) which possesses considerable merit. The object of it is the same as that of this. Its author remarks in his preface that his work 'may be useful not only to ecclesiastics, who ought to blush at their need of instruction in that matter, but also to those public men, who feel the necessity of maintaining the Catholic religion, and at the same time making it consistent with our liberties.' The liberal party in France, (to which both these authors belong,) insist upon the restoration of the Catholic religion to the simplicity and moderation of the ancient church, as a measure which is indispensable to the civil and religious liberties of that country. This simplicity has been marred, they say, by the false decretals, the decree of Gracian, the decretals of the popes, etc. and the church (than which as it was in the early ages no society could be more free) has, they affirm, become an engine of intolerance and even of despotism. This party is opposed by another, which contends for the system as it is, notwithstanding the admitted spuriousness of the decretals, upon which the most objectionable parts of the system are founded. Their disputes have given origin to many treatises of great learning and ability, upon the subject of the early discipline of the church—of the liberties of the Gallican church—of the pragmatics—of the concordats, etc. etc. It is not an absurd supposition, that causes which, in times past, have affected injuriously the public and individual interests of the people of France may, in times future, affect in like manner the citizens of other countries. On no other supposition can we, in any case, with propriety invoke history, as a guide in present emergencies. That the doctrines of this book, and the expedients proposed in it, are still accredited and approved by Catholic Frenchmen, distinguished for learning and talents, as well as by the popular voice of that country, is sufficiently shown by the testimony of M. Dupin, to the merits of this book and by the number of editions through which it has passed. It is impossible, that the Roman Catholic laity of the

United States, should condemn, what the intelligence and experience of the best minds in France decidedly approve, or that they should deem that, to be trivial, which, such men as the advocate general Talon, M. Dupin, M. Daunou and many others not less distinguished, have considered of the utmost importance to the social and political interests of their country."

5.—*The Elements of Political Economy. Abridged for the use of Academies. By Francis Wayland, D. D. President of Brown University, and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy.* Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 1837. pp. 254.

Our opinion of the original work of Dr. Wayland, from which the above has been abridged, was expressed in a former No. of the Repository, Vol. X. p. 399 seq. The author has now accomplished what we then suggested as highly desirable. He has so condensed and abridged his original work as to furnish an admirable text book for the use of academies and higher seminaries. We are glad to see this *Abridgement* before the public, and cordially recommend it.

6.—*Principles of Interpreting the Prophecies; briefly illustrated and applied. With Notes. By Henry Jones.* New York and Andover: Gould & Newman, 1837. pp. 150.

The principles formally stated in this book are *twenty-four*. In excogitating and arranging these principles the author seems to have confined himself principally to the study of the English Bible without recourse to the more extended investigations of others. The work is original and appears to have been the result of much study. Some of the principles here illustrated are not as well guarded as they might have been by more extensive learning, and some of them, we think, are not fully sustained. Yet the author has succeeded in stating with clearness some important facts, as "First principles of the oracles of God," which, as he remarks in his Introduction, "have heretofore been, and are still too much overlooked in the study of the prophecies." These principles are "easy to be understood and applied even by the unlearned," and may be safely submitted to every class of readers.

7.—*The Works of Joseph Addison, complete in Three Volumes. Embracing the whole of the "Spectator," etc.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1837. pp. 456, 459, 535.

The Works of Addison have acquired a reputation which needs not the aid of the periodical press to sustain it. They are among the richest treasures of English literature, and will not cease to be admired so long as the elegancies of the English language shall be

cultivated. The publishers of these works have done honor to the literary taste and refinement of our country by presuming on the sale of a large edition of these volumes. They have also done honor to themselves by the convenient and elegant form in which they have prepared and executed the work. Their own "Advertisement" prefixed to the first volume, which we subjoin, expresses all that we need to say in commending this edition to our readers, viz :

"In presenting to the American public this new edition of the writings of Joseph Addison, the publishers hold it altogether superfluous and unnecessary to say any thing in commendation of the works themselves, or make any reference to the established and increasing celebrity of the author. That celebrity has been deliberately conferred by a succession of generations, and the name of Addison is permanently enrolled among the brightest that adorn the Augustan age of English literature. A few words, however, of comment upon the peculiar advantages of this edition may be permitted, it is hoped, if on no other ground, at least as showing the anxiety of the publishers to provide the community with the best which they can obtain, and the most suited to gratify the wants and wishes of every reader.

The superiority of this edition over any heretofore published in this country, or, indeed in England, consists in its convenience of form, its low price, its accuracy, its neatness of mechanical execution, and above all, its completeness. It comprises not only all the essays, letters, poems, criticisms, tales, descriptions and dramatic works of Addison, *but also the whole of the Spectator* ; this last being a new and very useful arrangement, inasmuch as many of the finest essays, narratives and characters in that admirable series were contributed jointly by Addison and others. The delightful character of Sir Roger de Coverley, for instance, was frequently taken up by Steele, Budgell, and several others of the contributors who were quite as often employed in the beautiful papers relating to "the club" as was Addison himself. It is evident that, by separating those of the latter from the others, as has been done in former editions of his works, the continuity of the story is destroyed and the pleasure of the reader materially diminished. In this point of view alone the edition now offered must be considered vastly preferable.

Care has been taken, nevertheless, to designate not only the papers contributed by Addison, but also those furnished by each of the other writers ; and in all other respects the edition of the Spectator comprised within these volumes is as complete and perfect as any ever published. The publishers have only to add the expression of their hope, that the favor of the public to this undertaking may be such as shall encourage them to the production of other English classics in a corresponding style of excellence, literary and mechanical."

- 8.—*The Young Disciple; or, A Memoir of Anzonetta R. Peters.* By Rev. John A. Clark, Rector of St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia. Author of "*The Pastor's Testimony*," "*Walk about Zion*," "*Gathered Fragments*," etc. Philadelphia: William Marshall & Co. 1837. pp. 328.

The subject of this Memoir departed this life in the city of New York in the autumn of 1833, aged about eighteen years. She was a member of the Episcopal church, and her piety, to use the language of her biographer, "was of the brightest and holiest stamp." She was a grand-daughter of the Rev. Christopher Godfrey Peters, pastor of the Moravian church in the city of New York, who died in 1797, and cousin of Caroline Elizabeth Smelt, the history of whose wonderful conversion and dying testimony has done much to exalt the riches of free grace and win souls to Christ,—has been extensively read in this country, has passed through several editions in England, has been translated into the German, and is exerting its silent but effective influence in many countries. The memoir of Miss Peters is less striking and wonderful, but the spirit which pervades it is equally attractive, and its narrative equally suited to instruct and benefit the reader. It is well written and worthy of extensive circulation.

- 9.—*Religious Dissensions: Their Cause and Cure. A Prize Essay.* By Pharcellus Church, Author of "*Philosophy of Benevolence*." New York: Gould & Newman. Amherst: J. S. & C. Adams. Boston: Crocker & Brewster, Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. Hartford: Canfield & Robbins. Rochester: H. Stanwood & Co. 1838. pp. 400.

The manner in which this work has been brought before the public furnishes presumptive evidence of its substantial excellence. A premium of \$200 was offered for the best Tract or Treatise on Dissensions in the churches. From twenty-seven manuscripts, several of which, the committee say, were written with much ability and in an excellent spirit, they selected this for the premium.

On the announcement of this award we were happy to learn that it had fallen to the name of the Rev. Pharcellus Church. We have known this author only through his previous work entitled "*The Philosophy of Benevolence*," which we regard as one of the best books which has been issued from the American press. A distinguished clergyman, and a stranger to the author remarked to us, soon after its publication, that it was one of the few books which, having begun, he felt impelled to read entirely through. We have not yet had time to follow this example in our perusal of the "*Prize Essay*," but from the portions which we have read, our impression is that the author has fully equalled himself, in his former work. We in-

tend to read it through, and Providence permitting, to express our views more at large on the important and delicate subjects of which it treats in a future Number of the Repository.—In the mean time we commend this interesting and very seasonable publication to the diligent and devout use of the ministers and members of our churches of different names, whom the Saviour prays and commands to be ONE.

10.—*A New Translation of the Hebrew Prophets, arranged in chronological order. By George R. Noyes. Vol. III., containing Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Jonah and Malachi.* Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1837. pp. 294.

Mr. Noyes has now accomplished a translation of all the prophetic books of the Scriptures. He has persevered with most praiseworthy diligence, though, we regret to say, that but limited support has been yielded to his works. Much benefit in the way of understanding some of the most difficult portions of the Scriptures can be derived by all classes of readers in an examination of these translations. They embody some of the results of the most recent investigations which have been made in Germany in the Hebrew Scriptures. The notes are very brief. We are sorry that some things are to be found in them which show that Mr. Noyes has a very low opinion of the inspiration of the Bible, and which will preclude a large class of readers from obtaining much instruction from what is really valuable. Read the following: "Respecting the comparative merits of Ezekiel as a writer, there has been a considerable diversity of opinion, as may be seen in the remarks of bishop Lowth upon this prophet, in his Lectures on Hebrew Poetry, and the note of Michaelis. To me the judgment of Michaelis appears in this instance to be more correct than that of Lowth. Undoubtedly there are to be found in Ezekiel some striking passages, such as the vision of the dry bones, some great thoughts, such as that in 36: 26, and many bold images. But in general he wearies the reader by endless amplification and frequent repetition, and sometimes disgusts by his minuteness of detail in the delineation of gross images. One illustration, which Isaiah has despatched in a single verse, or a single expression, Is. 1: 21, Ezekiel has spun out into whole chapters, so as to lead us to wonder at the state of society, when such things would not be offensive to the taste of a writer of genius and his contemporary readers. See ch. xvi. and xxiii. His visions and allegories sometimes dazzle and confound rather than impress and instruct us, though it may be said that his contemporaries may have attached a meaning to them, where we cannot. Yet he was himself so sensible of the obscurity of some of his emblems and allegories, that he gives a verbal explanation of them. Some of his emblems are forced and unnatural, and there occurs occasionally

something ludicrous in their want of appropriateness, as when he takes an iron pan, and lays siege to it, as the emblem of enemies besieging the wall of a city. His language is generally prosaic, prolix, and without strength. There may appear to some readers a want of reverence in thus speaking of the style of the prophet; but since the time of bishop Lowth the style of the sacred writers has been regarded as their own, and made the subject of criticism, and in my opinion great injury is done to the just claims of the sacred writers by extravagant and indiscriminate eulogy." Such things require no comment. Far distant be the time when our theologians shall learn to think and write so irreverently of men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost! Mr. Noyes's views of the prophecies of the Old Testament in relation to the Messiah accord with those held by many in Germany, but which we hope will never have currency among us.

10.—*The Family Preacher; or, Domestic Duties illustrated and enforced in Eight Discourses. By Rev. Rufus William Bailey, of South Carolina.* New York: John S. Taylor, 1837. pp. 158.

The subjects discussed in this volume are the "duties of husbands,—of wives,—of females,—of parents,—of children,—of masters,—of servants." The sermons are short, and written in a finished and flowing style, which is at the same time simple and intelligible. They are of a highly practical character and well adapted to family reading.

11.—*A Mother's Request. Answered in Letters of a Father to his Daughters.* Philadelphia: Joseph Whetham, 1837. pp. 264.

This little volume is neatly finished in all respects, and is creditable both to the author and the publisher. Though published anonymously, it is from the pen of the Rev. R. W. Bailey of South Carolina, the author of the "Family Preacher," which we have noticed in a preceding paragraph. The preparation of these letters was the result of one of those mysterious providences, of not unfrequent occurrence, by which the mother of a young and dependent family is removed by death. This affliction in the present instance was attended with circumstances of thrilling interest, and the "Mother's Request," previous to her departure to a better world served to impress upon her surviving husband a still deeper sense of his parental responsibilities. Thus urged by a sacred regard to the wishes of his departed companion, on the one hand, and by the tenderest sympathies on the other, he has given expression to his parental solicitude in a series of excellent counsels, contained in *forty-three* letters to his daughters. The topics appear to be judiciously selected, and the sentiments of the book are conceived in a subdued and chastened

spirit, are expressed with elegance and neatness, and breathe the tone of piety throughout. It is worthy of an extensive circulation, and cannot fail to be read with profit by the sons and daughters of affliction.

ARTICLE XIII.

SELECT LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

UNITED STATES.

We have received the first sheets of Prof. Bush's Exposition of the books of Joshua and Judges. His main object is to afford facilities for the correct understanding of the sacred text—to aid the student of the Bible to ascertain with exactness the genuine sense of the original. Though the general aspect of the book is critical, yet practical remarks have been inserted to such an extent as to adapt it happily to popular use. One of the excellencies of the author's commentaries on the Scriptures is that he grapples with the really difficult passages, instead of adroitly passing them over, as some commentators do, with a cursory practical remark. We are glad to learn, that it is Prof. Bush's purpose to go over all the historical books of the Old Testament on the same plan. The book of Genesis is already in a considerable state of forwardness.

The first part of Prof. Nordheimer's Critical Grammar of the Hebrew Language has come to hand. It is printed at New Haven by B. L. Hamlen, and apparently with great accuracy. The paper is good and the whole appearance is neat and prepossessing. The work will be completed in two volumes, of about 300 pages each. The first volume, (the first part of which of 120 pages is now published,) will contain the whole of the Grammar as far as the Syntax; the second will contain the Syntax, and a grammatical analysis of select portions of the Scriptures, of progressive difficulty, including those portions usually read in the principal institutions of this country. The whole will be published in the course of the present year. The price of the two volumes will probably be about six dollars.

A small volume has just been published by Gould & Newman, entitled, "Thoughts on a New Order of Missionaries." We have not read the volume, and cannot speak of its merits. It does not propose to interfere at all, as we understand, with existing missionary organizations, but advocates the adoption of means for sending out *pious physicians* into all portions of the heathen world. The subject is important, and we have no doubt the book will attract attention.

We have received a short communication from a "Friend of Truth and Justice," requesting us to correct a remark which we made in our introductory article in January, 1837, in relation to the British Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. We there stated that at the time when this Society was publishing the Bible in two languages, the British and Foreign Bible Society were publishing it in 150. Our correspondent suggests that the former society does not, like the latter, limit its operations to one department of effort but that its labors embrace schools, missions, distribution of the Bible, and other books, translation of the Bible, lending libraries, and the relief of temporal necessities. Our correspondent also suggests that the former Society had accomplished a great amount of good before the rise of the Bible Society in 1804. In 1711, the Christian Knowledge Society had given instruction to nearly 5000 children; in 1761, it had established upwards of 1400 schools, in which were 40,000 children, in England and Wales, besides similar schools in Scotland and Ireland, and had in 1784, planted a number of missions, etc. We have only to say, in justification of ourselves, that the facts in our article were taken from Mr. Choules's *Origin and History of Missions*, that taking all the labors of the Christian Knowledge Society in view, at any one time, since the Bible Society was formed, it has exhibited much less energy than the latter, and that what energy it has possessed, has been apparently much augmented by the establishment of the Bible Society. These were the positions taken in our article, and we think the facts will warrant them, notwithstanding the suggestions of our correspondent.

A new edition of Prof. Stuart's *Hebrew Chrestomathy* and also of his *Grammar of the New Testament Dialect* will be published during the present year.

We observe that the Rev. Dr. Adams, president of the college of Charleston, S. C. has published a new work on *Moral Philosophy*. We hope to be able to give it an extensive review hereafter.

Prof. Hitchcock of Amherst College has published De La Beche's excellent *Manual of Geology*, with additional notes and illustrations.

PERSIA.

We have just received the following items of information from Mr. Perkins of Ooroomiah. "You inquire respecting European travellers, now in these regions. I know of but few. Monsieur Auchet Eloy, a French botanist recently travelled through Persia and the adjacent regions. He had gathered a large and very valuable collection of botanical specimens, and had reached Constantinople on his return; but in that city of conflagrations, his lodgings took fire, and his collection of plants and flowers—the fruits of almost endless toil—were all consumed in the flames. I think he will repeat his botanic excur-

sions, in these regions, as I believe it was his intention to publish. Mr. William Hamilton—a young English gentleman, has recently travelled in Asia Minor, and, I believe, to some extent, also, in Mesopotamia. He is a very able young man, and it is understood that he will publish the result of his travels. James Brant, Esq., His Britannic Majesty's consul at Erzroom, has travelled extensively in Asia Minor, and an interesting article from his pen, on the regions over which he has travelled, together with a map of the same, recently appeared in a periodical magazine of the Royal Geographical Society, published at London. I was kindly entertained by Mr. Brant, during my late visit at Erzroom, and he mentioned to me his intention of soon making a tour into Kûrdistân, the result of which he will doubtless be able to give to Christendom important information, respecting regions, which have never yet been visited by a European. The English embassy, in this country, are, at present, doing little of a literary nature. Its members are too fully occupied in political matters, to allow them the necessary time. Mr. Mc Neill, the ambassador, is a man of very high literary standing. Many interesting and able articles, from him, have, within a few years, appeared in Blackwood's Magazine. All the articles on Persia, that have been published in that work, are from his pen. The lithographic press, which was formerly at Tabreez, is now at Teherân, employed in publishing a periodical newspaper, under the auspices of the king. This is the first newspaper ever published in Persia—four numbers have been issued—and, though it is a small thing in itself, it is a day-star of glory for the civil regeneration of this country. It is edited by a Persian Meerza, who was once ambassador to England,—who speaks the English language—and is ardently desirous to see the light and civilization of Europe introduced into Persia. And as this light rolls in, how important is it, that the gospel should come with it, and give it the right direction ! We have nothing new, respecting Mount Ararat. On my late journey to Erzroom, I again passed along its base ; and I never felt so strong a desire to ascend it as in this instance. The earliness of the season, however, forbade the attempt. The snow extended down, at that time, (May,) almost to its base. But I have no doubt that it may be ascended, on the north-west side, which is by far the least steep, with the aid of proper facilities and preparations, and at the right season of the year. In August and September the snow covers not more than one third of the mountain. The region west and south-west of Ararat presents striking indications of having felt the effects of former volcanic action. For a distance of fifteen or twenty miles the surface of the ground is almost entirely covered with stones, each weighing from five to ten or fifteen pounds, which give indubitable evidence of having been in a state of partial fusion."

THE
AMERICAN
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

NO. XXX.

APRIL, 1838.

ARTICLE I.

THE EVIDENCES OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS, BY
ANDREWS NORTON. Vol. I. Boston, 1837.

Reviewed by M. Stuart, Prof. Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Seminary, Andover.

THE volume, which bears the title given above, is certainly a production of no ordinary stamp, and is a phenomenon in our literary hemisphere which ought to excite much interest. Our country has hitherto been very sparing of contributions to the stock of sacred literature; at least of such as are the fruit of long and intense study, and the result of a widely extended knowledge of antiquities either sacred or profane. We have so few men who can afford to bury themselves for a long time in the closets of libraries, and so few libraries that have closets well stocked with books; withal we are so intent upon the *practical* business of life—on making our fortunes, or building up a mere temporary and popular fame, or grasping at office—that we grow impatient under protracted years of effort in the acquisition of individual knowledge, and seldom endeavour to accomplish what the riper scholars of Europe are every day labouring to accomplish. And what is very discouraging to the few, who can surmount the usual obstacles, resist all temptations to acquire a mere short-lived celebrity, and consent to plough and sow with the certain apprehension that they must

wait for the harvest until some future period which may not arrive before it is too late for them to witness its gathering in—what indeed has hitherto almost paralyzed every attempt among us at long protracted and severe literary effort, is, that when any thing of this nature has been executed, it has rarely if ever met with such success as to encourage new adventurers in the same or the like undertakings. If a book does not either entertain the mass of our public, or show them how to become richer or more thrifty in their business, or is not indispensable as a professional work, the publishers may regard themselves as unusually fortunate, in case they get off without solid loss from an edition of 750 or at most 1000 copies. This is true of almost any thoroughly literary work which can be named.

It were easy to support these allegations by appeal to particular facts; but the detail of them would be an ungrateful labour, and lead me, moreover, quite away from the execution of the more pleasant task which I have now undertaken to perform. If any reader is so sensitive to the honour of the literary character of those who dwell this side of the Atlantic, as to look with suspicion on such statements as I have made, and to call them in question, let him make trial at the office of even the most intelligent and liberal of our publishers, and see what the result of his inquiries about the publication of a work of deep and recondite literature will be. Nor can he justly blame the publishers. How can they afford to print what the American public will not patronize? And how can they be responsible for the pursuits and the taste of all their countrymen?

Mr. Norton is one of the very few among us, who are placed in circumstances of literary ease and comfort. Not constrained to pursue the daily duties of an office, which he once held in the University of Cambridge, in order to provide for himself and his family, he seems to have relinquished them for the sake of a higher object—to devote himself without reserve to the pursuit of sacred literature in some of its most interesting and important branches. The work before us is the fruit of the leisure thus secured; and surely it bears testimony that this leisure-time has been very busily employed.

The author tells us, in his preface, that he began this work in 1819, and that he was then 'so much in error respecting the inquiries to which it would lead him, that he believed it might be accomplished in six months.' Every tyro in literature who afterwards makes any considerable advances, can at a later day

sympathize with such a feeling as this. He remembers the time, when he wondered that such men as have taken the lead in sacred literature or theology, should have occupied so many years in doing what seemed to him to be feasible in the course of a few weeks, or at most of a few months. How often is the diligent scholar reminded, that the mount of science is like that of natural vision ; the higher you ascend, the wider the prospect is extended. Even when we reach the summit, it is only to see that the prospect is boundless in every direction.

Mr. Norton, it seems, has been busied some *eighteen years* with his undertaking, instead of six months ; although this is not to be understood of his first volume only which is now published, but also of two more which are yet to appear. The public cannot complain of the author, by alleging in this case that he is hasty in his performance, seeing that the “*nonum prematur in annum*” has been doubled in the present instance. But the book in question gives evidence enough that it has not been lying idly by, during the greater part of these eighteen years. The investigations which it develops could never have been made without much time and severe labour.

It seems to have been the general persuasion of the English and American public, since the publication of the great work of Lardner on the Evidences of Christianity, and that of Paley, that little or nothing more remained to be done, in regard to the literary and archaeological part of this undertaking. Lardner seemed to have exhausted all the store houses of ancient Jewish, Heathen, or Christian testimonies to the existence and genuineness of the New Testament books ; and Paley, who has added little indeed to the archaeological part of this undertaking, has thrown the whole substance into such a compact, tangible, intelligible form, employed such skill and address in his reasoning, and so admirably adapted the whole to popular ends, at least for the instruction of the greater part of the well-informed community, that there did not seem to be any call for further effort in regard to this part of Christian Apologetics. In addition to this it should also be remarked, that within the last half century very few infidel works have appeared in the English language, which had any claim to literary pretensions, or which needed any refutation from a knowledge of antiquity. They have been little else than a repetition of the stale criticisms and jeers of Voltaire, La Mettrie, Paine, and a few others of the like class ; and whatever show of argument has been exhibited,

it has been mostly of the *a priori* kind, either assuming that the attributes of God are utterly inconsistent with the doctrines and narratives of the Bible, or else that we are equally destitute of evidence both in respect to the being and attributes of God and the truth of the Scriptures.

After all the learning and ability, however, that Lardner and Paley have shewn in England in relation to the subject before us, or Schmidt, Kleuker, or Less have exhibited on the Continent of Europe, there has sprung up, within the last generation, a new reason for further effort, such as Mr. Norton has made. *Novus seclorum incipit ordo*; but in a very different sense, no doubt, from that which the poet meant to convey. Semler, Eckermann, Eichhorn, Paulus, Gabler, Henke, and many others of the like stamp, in Germany, have, in one way and another, assailed the general and settled belief of the Christian church at large, in respect to the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament Scriptures, from quarters that were unexpected, and in a manner which for a while was perplexing and somewhat disheartening to the most strenuous defenders of the older and long established sentiments of Christians in general.

Neology in Germany has indeed had, for a while, apparently a prosperous run and propitious gales. The time was, and for more than one decemium too, when there was not more than one solitary magazine in all Germany, of any great literary pretensions, which maintained both the genuineness and the authenticity of the sacred books. This was the highly respectable *Magazin* of Storr, Flatt, and others, at Tübingen. Now and then a solitary voice was heard, in defence of the Old Testament or of the New, like that of Jahn, or in some respects of Hug, and of a few writers of smaller treatises. How greatly are those times changed! A predominant party in literature are plainly rising up, at present, who believe and maintain for substance the long established doctrines of the Christian churches in relation to these topics. Another day, I fully believe a better one, is dawning once more on the churches of the Continent.

Widely diffused as German literature is beginning to be in this country and in England, it is unwise, indeed it is impossible, for us to remain idle spectators of the great contest which has been and still is going on. If those who believe in and wish to defend either the genuineness, or the authenticity, or both, of the Old Testament and the New, choose to slumber on their

post, and let neological views have their course without any effort to check or regulate them, they may be assured that in the end this country will see a revolution not unlike, in many respects, to that in Germany. There is no small part of our community, after all that we say and may justly say about the prevalence of Christian faith among us, who would be glad of an opportunity fairly to escape from the obligation which the Bible imposes upon their consciences. They have been so educated, however, that they cannot do this by embracing at once, and in their revolting and blasphemous forms, the sentiments of a Paine, a Godwin, a Taylor (of London), or of a much more insignificant class still—an Owen, a Fanny Wright, or an Abner Kneeland. The gulf is too wide, deep, and foul, to be inviting to them. But if some writer like Eichhorn should rise up among us, who to all the charms of genius and taste should add a widely diffused knowledge of classical and sacred learning, and who should attack the genuineness of the sacred writings on grounds of archaeological history and criticism ; in a word, if any one should by his talents and learning contribute to make the cause of skepticism respectable among the well informed classes of society ; I doubt not that sooner or later we should have a large neological party in our country. I ask every sober and enlightened man, who is well acquainted with the state of feeling among men of the world, whether irreligion, or skepticism, if once made respectable by an appearance of learned investigation and great talents, would not be gratefully accepted by many, in order to get rid of the burden that now lies on their consciences, in consequence of their education, or of the influence of the circles of friends in which they now move.

For my own part, I cannot doubt of this. Of course I cannot doubt the expediency of preparing for the great contest which must ensue, if once the views of Neologists shall become current among us. I would not anticipate these, and diffuse them prematurely. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. It is not good policy, rather, I would say, it is not sound prudence, to fill the ears of the community with reports of danger coming upon the cause of truth, which is new, unexpected, and of a highly threatening character. A general need not proclaim in glowing language to his army, on the eve of contest, the terrible power of the enemy with whom they are to combat, and thus send them into the field half-conquered before the

onset of battle. But on the other hand, he may easily carry his discretion in this respect a great deal too far. If the enemy whom the general is to meet are furnished with a new sort of arms, have acquired some new military tactics which are formidable, or posted themselves on vantage ground unknown to his own army, then he would be rash indeed not to inform his soldiers of all this, and not to instruct them how they are to cope with and overcome these new or formidable means of attack or resistance.

Such, in some respects, I deem the situation of our community to be. The progress of German literature, and of that part of it which is *neological*, cannot now be prevented. If it is impeded here and there, it will burst out in other places. There are among us literary men enough, and men rather inclined to skepticism, to think and act for themselves in the choice and purchase of books. There are learning and talent enough displayed in many—very many—of the German neological works, to excite curiosity highly, and at least to command literary respect. It is not within the power, then, of the sober, believing, religious part of the community, to put a stop to the reading and diffusion of such works. And this being most plainly the state of the case, I think we have no way left but to prepare for the worst, and to take the vantage ground if we can in the contest, by shewing those who would attack the cause of settled belief in the Scriptures, that neither their attacks are unprovided for by us, nor their weapons or tactics unknown to us.

Let us not dream of a *black list*, an *index expurgatorius*, of books, in this free country and Protestant land, from access to which our youth or others are prohibited. Some parents have tried the experiment of shutting up their children from all intercourse with others, in order to keep them from being contaminated. The result has nearly always been, that when they did go out at last into the world, being strangers in point of experience to all its temptations and allurements, they fell an easy prey to them, and were undone for life. So in the case before us; particularly, I would say, in regard to young men who are now in a course of education for the ministry. If we keep them, either in Seminaries or under private tuition, from all acquaintance with what neology has done or is now doing in respect to the Scriptures either of the Old Testament or the New, when they go out into the world they will meet with those who have drunk in the new doctrines. They will be attacked by them;

attacked with the learning and skill which Eichhorn and others of the like cast have furnished, ready to their hand; and they will, from the necessity of the case, be shocked and confounded by the assault, if not overthrown. Besides this too, many sensible inquirers among the laity, who have heard conversation on topics involved in such a controversy, or read something concerning them, will be naturally led to inquire of their pastor what all this means. If he is ignorant of it, or cannot in any becoming and satisfactory manner solve their doubts or quiet their apprehensions, then their difficulties will be increased, and in all probability will end in a state of skepticism.

Semper paratus, then, should be the maxim of the young theologian, at a time like this. And if this be so, then I would ask, whether there is any way so good, for those who direct the studies of young men that are candidates for the ministry, as prudently and cautiously to make known to them the substance of neological doctrine, whether critical or theological, and instruct them how to answer the objections which it raises. What! Shall we spend weeks and months in combating the infidels and skeptics of early ages or of past generations; must Hume and Collins and Shaftsbury and Tolland and Tindal be met and refuted, at all points and with great care, although they have mostly argued on grounds that are merely *a priori*, and shall the far more powerful and subtle skeptics of the present day, whose appeal is professedly to antiquity and criticism, be passed by in silence, or studiously excluded from the circle of our consideration? Believe this who may, I cannot accede to it. Every age has its own peculiarities, its own dangers, its own corruptions, and its own weapons of assault upon the Scriptures. It is not meet that we should live so much out of the age to which we belong, and be conversant only with times that are forever gone by.

I have made these remarks in order to show, that the work of Mr. Norton is not in any measure to be deemed superfluous, because we have the works of Lardner, Paley, and others of a similar character in English, or the works of Schmidt, Less, Kleuker, etc., in German and Latin. Mr. Norton has, in the Preface to his work, given us reasons why he entered *de novo* upon the investigations which led to it—reasons which I think ought to satisfy every one who is acquainted with the present state of sacred criticism and literature.

In order that the readers of this Periodical may obtain some

definite view of the positions which have been taken by leading Neologists in respect to the genuineness of the Gospels, it is proper that some extracts from Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament should here be presented. Complaint cannot be made that this class of writers are unfairly dealt with in our statements respecting them, when they are left to speak for themselves. I cannot do better here, than to introduce an extract from Mr. Norton's introductory *Statement of the Case*, viz. of the matter in dispute, or the subject which he has undertaken to discuss. The passages with double commas at the beginning and end are translations by him from Eichhorn; the remainder consists of his own remarks, intermixed for the sake of illustration and in order to secure accuracy of statement.

"Justin Martyr," says Eichhorn, "who was born A. D. 89, and died A. D. 163, a Samaritan, a native of Flavia Neapolis, early became converted from a heathen philosopher to a zealous Christian, and was one of the earliest Christian writers. He nowhere quotes the life and sayings of Jesus according to our present four Gospels, which he was not acquainted with. This is a very important circumstance in regard to the history of the Gospels; as he had devoted many years to travel, and resided a long time in Italy and Asia Minor."

On the whole, it is concluded by Eichhorn and others, that our four Gospels, *in their present form*, were not in use, and were not known, till the end of the second century. Previously to that time, it is supposed, that other gospels were in circulation, allied to those which we possess, but not the same. "If we will not," says Eichhorn, "be influenced by mere assertions and unsupported tradition, but by the only sure evidence of history, we must conclude that before our present Gospels, other decidedly different gospels were in circulation, and were used during the first two centuries in the instruction of Christians." Eichhorn, however, does not deny that the canonical Gospels are, *in a certain sense*, the works of the authors to whom they have been ascribed. He expressly defends the genuineness of that of John; and with regard to the three others, he says: "According to the uniform tradition of the Church, the first three Gospels proceeded from Matthew, Mark, and Luke. This tradition is not to be called in question, unless there are strong reasons against it; and where are such reasons to be found?" He contends, however, that the Gospels have been *grossly corrupted*. His statements respecting this subject are connected with his account of the supposed common origin of the first three of our present Gospels, and of the gospels which he believes to have been in use before those we now possess. This account is as follows:

There was very early in existence a short historical sketch of the life of Christ, which may be called the Original Gospel. This was, probably, provided for the use of those assistants of the apostles in the work of teaching Christianity, who had not themselves seen the actions and heard the discourses of Christ. It was however but 'a rough sketch, a brief and imperfect account, without historical plan or methodical arrangement.' In this respect it was, according to Eichhorn, very different from our four Gospels. "These present no rough sketch, such as we must suppose the first essay upon the life of Jesus to have been; but, on the contrary, are works written with art and labor, and contain portions of his life, of which no mention was made in the first preaching of Christianity." This Original Gospel was the basis both of the earlier gospels used during the first two centuries, and of the first three of our present Gospels, namely, those of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, by which those earlier gospels were finally superseded. The earlier gospels retained more or less of the rudeness and incompleteness of the Original Gospel.

"But they very soon fell into the hands of those who undertook to supply their defects and incompleteness, both in the general compass of the history, and in the narration of particular events. Not content with a life of Jesus, which, like the gospel of the Hebrews, and those of Marcion and Tatian, commenced with his public appearance, there were those who early prefixed to the Memoirs used by Justin Martyr, and to the gospel of Cerinthus, an account of his descent, his birth, and the period of his youth. In like manner, we find, upon comparing together, in parallel passages, the remaining fragments of these gospels, that they were receiving continual accessions. The voice from heaven at the baptism of Jesus, was originally stated to have been: *Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee*; as it is quoted by Justin Martyr in two places. Clement of Alexandria found the same, in a gospel of which we have no particular description, with the addition of the word, 'beloved': *Thou art my beloved son; this day have I begotten thee*. Other gospels represented the voice as having been: *Thou art my beloved son, with whom I am well pleased*; as it is given in the catholic Gospels, namely, in Mark 1: 11. In the gospel of the Ebionites, according to Epiphanius, both accounts of the voice from heaven were united: *Thou art my beloved son, with whom I am well pleased; and again; This day have I begotten thee*. By these continual accessions, the original text of the life of Jesus was lost in a mass of additions, so that its words appeared among them but as insulated fragments. Of this any one may satisfy himself from the account of the baptism of Jesus, which was compiled out of various gospels. The necessary consequence was, that at last truth and falsehood, authentic and fabulous narratives, or such, at least, as through long tradition had become disfigured and falsified, were brought together

promiscuously. The longer these narratives passed from mouth to mouth, the more uncertain and disfigured they would become. At last, at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century, in order, as far as might be, to preserve the true accounts concerning the life of Jesus, and to deliver them to posterity as free from error as possible, the Church, out of the many gospels which were extant, selected four, which had the greatest marks of credibility, and the necessary completeness for common use. There are no traces of our present Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, before the end of the second and the beginning of the third century. Irenaeus, about the year 202, first speaks decisively of four gospels; and imagines all sorts of reasons for this particular number; and Clement of Alexandria, about the year 216, labored to collect divers accounts concerning the origin of these four Gospels, in order to prove that these alone should be acknowledged as authentic. From these facts, it is evident, that first, about the end of the second and the beginning of the third century, the Church labored to establish the universal authority of these four Gospels, which were in existence before, if not altogether in their present form, yet in most respects such as we now have them, and to procure their general reception in the Church, with the suppression of all other gospels then extant.

“Posterity would indeed have been under much greater obligations, if, together with the Gospel of John, the Church had established, by public authority, only the first rough sketch of the life of Jesus, which was given to the earliest missionaries to authenticate their preaching; after separating it from all its additions and augmentations. But this was no longer possible; for there was no copy extant free from all additions, and the critical operation of separating this accessory matter was too difficult for those times.”

“Many ancient writers of the church,” Eichhorn subjoins in a note, “doubted the genuineness of many parts of our Gospels; but were prevented from coming to a decision by want of critical skill;” pp. 6—13.

I trust the readers of this Miscellany will not find fault with the length of this extract. Many of them, who have often heard of German Neology, and now and then met with some fragments of it here and there introduced and discussed, may not have had the opportunity of reading a brief *exposé* written by the neological Coryphaeus of the past generation. The extracts just made present them with such a view; and the remarks which are subjoined here and there by Mr. Norton, exhibit a candid and correct account of the case as it actually stands.

The chief aim of the text or leading part of Mr. Norton’s

book, is to examine these positions of Eichhorn in relation to the Gospels. In order to do this, he divides his work into two parts ; in the first of which he endeavours to establish the proposition, that "*the Gospels remain essentially the same as they were originally composed ;*" and in the second, that "*they have been ascribed to their true authors.*"

In proof of his first proposition, he labours, in Chap. I., to shew "the agreement of the respective copies of the four Gospels," i. e. the uniformity or harmony of the same Gospels, which exists between all the different manuscripts or copies of them in different ages and countries, or (in other words) the uniformity of text which pervades the totality of them at all times and in all places.

In order not to be misunderstood, the author begins by informing his readers what exceptions are to be made to this general declaration. He does not suppose the present Greek text of Matthew to be the *original*, but only an *early translation* of the original Hebrew copy which was current in Palestine. Nor does he suppose, that no accident has ever befallen any single word, phrase, or verse, of any of the Gospels, but that these books have been exposed, like other ancient books, to some errors and variations introduced by copyists and others through mistake on various grounds and from a variety of causes. He enumerates what he believes to be interpolations ; in which he is much more liberal to his opponents, than I, with my present views, can possibly persuade myself to be. The two first chapters of Matthew, he thinks, did *not* belong to the original Gospel of this writer ; as also Matt. 27: 3—10, containing the narrative respecting Judas' repentance and suicide ; and Matt. 27: 52, 53, containing an account of the resurrection of many saints and their appearance in Jerusalem after the resurrection of the Saviour. Luke 22: 43, 44, which relates that an angel appeared and strengthened the Saviour during his agony and bloody sweat, is also, in his apprehension, of a suspicious character ; and John 21: 24, 25, (the last part of v. 24 and the whole of v. 25) "has the air of an editorial note." Besides these, John 3: 3, 4, (the last clause of v. 3 and the whole of v. 4), containing the passages respecting angelic influence on the waters of the pool at Bethesda, is very questionable ; and John 8: 3—10, containing an account of the woman that was taken in the act of adultery and brought to Jesus, is "justly regarded by a majority of modern critics, as not having been a part of the original Gospel."

It is proper that we should hear him speak for himself as to the manner in which he supposes these interpolations to have been made.

The two passages last mentioned, and the other *interpolations* that have been suggested, that is, the two insertions into the body of the text of the original Hebrew of Matthew's Gospel, and one into that of Luke's Gospel, were, we may suppose, first written as notes or additional matter in the margin of some copies of the Gospel in which they are found. But passages belonging to the text of a work, which had been accidentally omitted by a transcriber, were, likewise, often preserved in the margin. From this circumstance, notes and additional matter, thus written, were not unfrequently mistaken for parts of the text, and introduced by a subsequent copier into what he thought their proper place. This is a fruitful source of various readings in ancient writings; and may explain how the passages in question, if not genuine, have become incorporated with the text of the Gospels; p. 25 seq.

After these remarks he goes on and endeavours to shew, that all these interpolations might have been made in the ordinary course of things, without any design to corrupt the Gospels. The very fact that spurious passages can be thus distinguished from the original, is a pledge, as he intimates, for the integrity of the rest; and at all events, as he more than once intimates in other passages, nothing important in regard to Christian doctrine, or duty is lost, in case we exclude the interpolations in question.

On this part of Mr. Norton's treatise I shall take occasion hereafter to make some remarks, and particularly to inquire, whether it is so clear, as he seems to consider it, that the original Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew, and that the two first chapters are made up of extraneous matter, composed by another author. For the present therefore I dismiss these topics, in order to pursue the main object of Mr. Norton's book, and to shew the manner in which he has treated his subject.

The essential agreement of the Mss. of the Gospels is thus briefly and strikingly stated by him.

There have been examined, in a greater or less degree, about six hundred and seventy manuscripts of the whole, or of portions, of the Greek text of the Gospels. These were written in different countries, and at different periods, probably from the fifth century, downwards. They have been found in places widely remote from each other, in Asia, in Africa, and from one extremity of Europe to the other. Besides these manuscripts of the Greek text, there are many

manuscripts of ancient versions of the Gospels, in at least eleven different languages of the three great divisions of the world just mentioned. There are, likewise, many manuscripts of the works of the Christian fathers, abounding in quotations from the Gospels; and, especially, of ancient commentaries on the Gospels, such as those of Origen, who lived in the third century, and of Chrysostom, who lived in the fourth; in which we find their text quoted, as the different portions of it are successively the subjects of remark.

Now, all these different copies of the Gospels, or parts of the Gospels, so numerous, so various in their character, so unconnected, offering themselves to notice in parts of the world so remote from each other, concur in giving us essentially the same text; p. 28 seq.

After some explanatory remarks he proceeds thus:

The agreement among the extant copies of any one of the Gospels, or of portions of it, is essential; the disagreements are accidental and trifling, originating in causes, which, from the nature of things, we know must have been in operation. Every copy of any one of the Gospels presents us with essentially the same work, the same general history, the same particular facts, the same doctrines, the same precepts, the same characteristics of the writer, the same form of narration, the same style, and the same use of language; and by comparing together different copies, we are able to ascertain the original text to a great degree of exactness; or, in other words, where various readings occur, to determine what were probably the words of the author. The Greek manuscripts, then, of any one of the Gospels, the versions of it, and the quotations from it by the fathers, are all, professedly, copies of that Gospel or of parts of it; and these copies correspond with each other. But as these professed copies thus correspond with each other, it follows that they were derived more or less remotely from one archetype. Their agreement admits of no explanation, except that of their being conformed to a common exemplar. In respect to each of the Gospels, the copies which we possess must all be referred, for their source, to one original Gospel, one original text, one original manuscript. As far back as our knowledge extends, Christians, throughout all past ages, in Syria, at Alexandria, at Rome, at Carthage, at Constantinople, and at Moscow, in the east and in the west, have all used copies of each of the Gospels, which were evidently derived from one original manuscript, and necessarily imply that such a manuscript, existing as their archetype, has been faithfully copied; p. 29 seq.

After these just and very apposite remarks, the author goes on to shew, in a very graphic manner, what an *olla podrida* the text of the Gospels would have been—a *Mischmasch* truly, as Bertholdt rashly enough asserts of the *Textus Receptus*—

in case the original copies of the Gospels had been dealt with in the manner that Eichhorn has stated. Well has he said, that 'they would have been as unlike, as the Arabic copies of the Arabian Nights' Entertainment, or the Mss. of the *Gesta Romanorum*.' He might have gone still further. From the frequency with which they have been copied, and from the nature of the case where so much of the miraculous is exhibited, they would have been, it is nearly certain, much more discrepant than the copies of those fictions.

It would be doing injustice to this weighty argument not to exhibit the remarks which the author makes upon it.

The argument which has been employed, seems easy to be comprehended ; and at the same time conclusive of the fact, that all our present copies of each of the Gospels are to be traced back to one original manuscript, in multiplying the copies of which, no such liberties can have been taken by transcribers, as are supposed in the hypothesis under consideration. The argument seems, likewise, very obvious ; yet its force and bearing appear to have been overlooked in framing that hypothesis. The fact does not seem to have been distinctly adverted to, that the transcriber or possessor of a manuscript, making such alterations as the hypothesis supposes, could introduce them only into a single copy, and into such others as might be transcribed from it ; and that he could not, properly speaking, add to or corrupt the work itself. His copy would have no influence upon contemporary copies ; and in the case of the Gospels, we may say, upon numerous contemporary copies, in which the true text might be preserved, or into which different alterations might be introduced. It is quite otherwise, since the invention of printing. He who now introduces a corruption into the printed edition of a work, introduces it into all the copies of that edition ; if it be the only edition, into all the copies of that work ; and in many cases, into a great majority of the copies which are extant, or which are most accessible. All these copies will agree in presenting us with the same changes or interpolations. He may properly be said to corrupt the work itself. . . . The power of an ancient copier to alter the text of a work was very different from that of a modern editor ; yet it would seem, that they must have been confounded in the hypothesis under consideration ; unless some further account is to be given of the manner, in which the text of our present Gospels has been formed and perpetuated ; p. 33 seq.

In the *Notes* which have relation to the integrity and uniformity of the text of the Gospels, are some very interesting and useful remarks and illustrations. But I shall have occasion to advert again and separately to them, in the sequel.

Eichhorn, whose mind could not but be apprehensive of the substantial uniformity of the Gospel-text, the world over, and who could not resist the feeling that some plausible account, at least, of this extraordinary phenomenon should be given, has suggested that in process of time, i. e. as he thinks, near the end of the second and the beginning of the third century, '*the Church, out of the many Gospels which were extant, selected four which had the greatest marks of credibility, and the necessary completeness for common use.*'

The answer to this by Mr. Norton, is complete and absolutely overwhelming. After indulging so much in extracts as I have already done, and must hereafter do, I shall refrain from presenting it at length before the reader in the words of the author. Suffice it to say, that he has strikingly exhibited the facts, that the church was at that period not a regularly organized body having extended ecclesiastical jurisdiction. There were no general councils; no acknowledged single or complex head; no religion established and regulated by civil law;—in a word, no appointed and generally acknowledged authority of any kind, either to sanction or condemn books for the whole church. Besides all this, the churches were in a state of persecution; they were separated from each other by distance, by diversity of habits, manners, customs and language; and the eastern churches, moreover, had been excommunicated by the western, i. e. by Victor of Rome, before the period in question, so that great asperity of feeling existed in various respects between them. Under circumstances like these; and also, I may add, when editorial criticism on Mss. and editions was a thing unpractised to any considerable extent, and in some respects novel and strange; the supposition of Eichhorn is an absurdity—an utter and palpable absurdity. It has not the shadow of a fact to rest upon, and is altogether a fancy, like a multitude of others which he has thrown out upon the world, generated purely in his own fancy-loving brain.

I cannot forbear, however, from giving the reader the closing paragraph of this prostrating assault upon Eichhorn's position. It runs thus:

But we may even put out of view all the preceding considerations. "The Church," it is said, "about the end of the second, and the beginning of the third century, first labored to procure the general reception of the four Gospels in the Church." By the Church, must be meant the great body of Christians. The general reception of

the Gospels was founded upon the belief, real or pretended, of their being the genuine works of those to whom they were ascribed. The statement, therefore, resolves itself into the following dilemma. Either the great body of Christians determined to believe what they knew to be false ; or they determined to profess to believe it. The first proposition is an absurdity in terms ; the last is a moral absurdity ; p. 40 seq.

On p. 42 seq. the reader will find a long and interesting Note, which contains an examination of some additional positions of Eichhorn's in the *second* edition of his Introduction to the New Testament, and which are in themselves substantial contradiction of his opinion as stated in the preceding paragraphs. Yet although he has, in this new edition, represented the present copies of our Gospels as coming in *tacitly* and without opposition during the period between A. D. 150 and 175, and this by virtue of weight and authority given to them in consequence of their titles, (i. e. *The Gospel according to Matthew, Mark, etc.*), yet in another part of this second edition he has left the passages that have been quoted and examined above, just as they were in the first edition of his work. This, on the part of Eichhorn, is presuming a great deal, either on the good nature of the public toward him, or on their stupidity ; for stupid they must indeed be, in case they should not perceive that his two positions are quite at variance with each other.

The general argument in favour of the integrity of the New Testament Mss. and Codices down to the present time, as exhibited in the preceding pages, may be applied, as Mr. Norton supposes, in its full strength, to the Mss. in circulation near the end of the second century. In order to shew how difficult it would have been to bring about any considerable changes in copies of the Gospels at that day, Mr. Norton endeavours to calculate, as near as may be, how many copies of these, at the least estimation of their numbers, must have been in circulation.

Our present Gospels, it is conceded, were in common use among Christians about the end of the second century. The number of manuscripts then in existence bore some proportion to the number of Christians, and this, to the whole population of the Roman empire. The population of the Roman empire in the time of the Antonines is estimated by Gibbon at about one hundred and twenty millions ; and, probably, it had not decreased at the period of which we are speaking. With regard to the proportion of Christians, the same writer observes : " The most favourable calculation will not permit

us to imagine, that more than a twentieth part of the subjects of the empire had enlisted themselves under the banner of the cross before the important conversion of Constantine." If not more than a twentieth part of the empire was Christian at the end of the third century, just after which the conversion of Constantine took place, we can hardly estimate more than a fortieth part of it as Christian at the end of the second century ; p. 45 seq.

The author then adduces several passages, and very striking ones they are, from Pliny and Tertullian, which shew that the estimate of one *fortieth* part for Christians, falls, in all probability, very far short of the truth. He accepts it however, because he chooses to come much within the bounds that may be thought just and proper, rather than hazard any thing by going a step beyond them. He then proceeds :

"The fortieth part of one hundred and twenty millions, the estimated population of the empire, is three millions. There were Christians without the bounds of the empire, but I am willing to include those also in the number supposed. At the end of the second century, then, there were three millions of believers, using our present Gospels, regarding them with the highest reverence, and anxious to obtain copies of them. Few possessions could have been more highly valued by a Christian than a copy of those books, which contained the history of the religion for which he was exposing himself to the severest sacrifices. Their cost, if he were able to defray it, must have been but a very trifling consideration. But a common copy of the Gospels was not a book of any great bulk or expense. I shall not, therefore, I think, be charged with over estimating, if I suppose that there was one copy of the Gospels for every fifty Christians. Scattered over the world as they were, if the proportion of them to the heathens was no greater than has been assumed, fifty Christians would often be as many as were to be found in any one place, and often more ; but we cannot suppose that there were many collections of Christians without a copy of the Gospels. Origen, upon quoting a passage from the New Testament, says that it is written not "in any rare books, read only by a few studious persons ; but in those in the most common use." In truth, there can be little doubt, that copies of the Gospels were owned by a large portion of Christians who had the means of procuring them ; and in supposing only one copy of these books for every fifty Christians, the estimate is probably much within the truth. This proportion, however, will give us sixty thousand copies of the Gospels for three millions of Christians ; pp. 49—52.

To forestall the objection here, that the copies of the Gospels could not have been so numerous, because of the high price

of Mss. in ancient times, the author has given us in a Note, some matter of curious interest respecting the price of ancient books. Martial, in his Epigrams, has stated the price of his 13th book, which contains 272 verses, to have been *four sestertii*; or, if this should be thought too much, *two sestertii*, which would still leave a profit, as he says, to the bookseller. The last named sum amounts to about *seven cents* of our money.

With such facts in view, one can scarcely refrain from believing, that the estimate of 60,000 copies of the Gospels as being in circulation at the close of the second century, is far—very far—within the bounds of truth. Other facts adduced by the author cast still more light on the subject, and render it altogether probable, in my apprehension, that if he had doubled, or even trebled, the number of copies, he would still have been within the bounds of truth and soberness.

Now as Irenaeus, about 180, asserts the *general* reception and acknowledged authority among Christians of the *four* Gospels, in language as strong and as unlimited as would be employed at the present moment, it must follow of course, as Mr. Norton justly concludes, that these Gospels had been a *long time* in circulation, in order to be so widely diffused and universally received.

In Chapter II. Mr. Norton proceeds to adduce other considerations, which serve to confirm the position which he has taken. He shows, in the first place, that “it would have been inconsistent with the common sentiments and practice of mankind, for transcribers to make such alterations and additions as have been imagined, in the sacred books which they were copying.” Such practices do not appear in the works of Thucydides, Tacitus, and other historians. But the Gospels, in addition to the usual motives for care in transcription, present the highly important and influential ones which are drawn from their being deemed *sacred*. They were the basis of the Christian religion, inasmuch as the words and deeds of Jesus, recorded in them, must be the foundation of this religion. It would have been deemed sacrilegious, therefore, to have purposely mutilated or disfigured these records in any way whatever.

To illustrate and confirm this, Mr. Norton brings passages from Papias, Justin Martyr, Dionysius of Corinth, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and others, which are quite to his purpose, and fully exhibit the common sentiments of Christians at that time, in respect to preserving the integrity of

the sacred books. He might have appealed, moreover, to the common sentiments and views of the Jews, in relation to transcribing the Old Testament in general, but particularly the Pentateuch. The *Tractatus Sophorum*, written no doubt at an early period, exhibits such minute rules and prescriptions in regard to copyists, as no other book on earth, I believe, can be found to exhibit. The prevailing sentiment among Christians must in all probability have been such, in regard to their sacred books, as the Jews from whom they derived them were wont to entertain.

Another view of this subject is presented by Mr. Norton. The Christian writers near the close of the second century and at the beginning of the third, bring reiterated charges against Marcion and other heretics, for mutilating and altering the sacred books. The severe censure which they cast upon them on account of this, does not leave us at liberty to suppose that such alterations were things of every day's occurrence among Christians in general.

In particular does Mr. Norton advert, and with great justice and propriety, to the critical works of Origen, as furnishing evidence against the supposed alterations and variations of the New Testament Mss. Origen furnished a critical edition of the Septuagint framed on the basis of comparison of Mss. He had a critical taste, and was very much inclined to indulge it. Yet all the discrepancies which he notices in the New Testament Mss., are such as, for the most part, are still to be found in them, having been so long and faithfully preserved.

Our author next goes into an examination of a passage in Origen, which has often been quoted in order to confirm such statements as Eichhorn has made, concerning the alterations and variations in the ancient Mss. He shows, and I think satisfactorily, that no more than the common and well-known sources of error at all times are asserted by Origen. Certainly, if we compare this passage with the variations actually exhibited in this father's critical and exegetical works, we cannot suppose that any thing less than an extravagant estimate has been made of it by neologists in criticism. Compared with a passage from Griesbach, produced here in a Note by Mr. Norton, Origen's language is quite moderate and tame; and yet, as we shall see in the sequel, Griesbach had but little ground indeed, even after the lapse of so many centuries and so much time and room for variations, to make such an assertion.

I may well recommend to the sober and inquisitive reader, other remarks which the author here makes upon Origen's words, and also upon the representations of other ancient writers, in respect to the text of the Gospels.

Nor are the remarks of Mr. Norton less striking, upon the specific and individual character of each Gospel, in regard to its style and manner throughout. Each one has its own peculiar characteristics, which are uniformly preserved. Now this could never have been so, had additions and alterations been continually made from time to time, as they are represented by some to have been. One very striking proof of this is exhibited by Mr. Norton in his Addenda, Note C : where he presents us with three interpolations which are contained in some Codices, but which are so manifestly foreign to the style, manner, and matter of the Evangelists, that even the most unpractised reader could not fail to discover that they must be adscititious. One of these is an addition inserted after Matt. 20: 28. On this I must beg leave to make a few remarks.

I shall not occupy these pages, by inserting the evidently spurious addition just named. But, as no attentive critical reader will, at the present day, fail to judge as Mr. Norton has done respecting it, and this on the ground that the internal evidence of foreign and extrinsic origin is overwhelming and decisive ; so I have a suggestion to make here, for Mr. Norton's consideration. If this interpolation of some three or four verses, is so plainly disclosed by its own style and matter, how comes it about that the whole of the two first chapters of this same Evangelist could consist of extraneous and adscititious matter, and yet there be no difference of style or manner from that of the book in general ? That there is not any perceptible difference, is a fact which I would establish by appeal to the judgment of every impartial reader. Nay, that positive resemblances, not to say identities, of style are spread over the whole of the two chapters in question, has been made out, in a manner past all fair contradiction, by Gersdorf in his *Beiträge zur Sprach-Characteristik der Schriftsteller des N. Testaments*. This I take to be generally admitted.

The reply of Mr. Norton would probably be, that ' this uniformity or similarity of style arises from the hand of one and the same translator of the whole book from the Hebrew originals.' But this cannot be satisfactory. The *literality* of ancient translations is too well known to be in general called in

question. At all events, the fidelity of the translator of Matthew, if there were any such person, must have been early and universally conceded; for in the very next generation after the apostles, we have decisive evidence, i. e. in Justin Martyr, that the two first chapters of Matthew were regarded and quoted as a part of his Gospel—and of his Gospel in *Greek*. Of this however, I intend to speak hereafter. It is enough for the present to say, that nothing less than a *designed* transformation of the original, in the process of translation into the Greek, can be supposed, if we maintain the ground that the two first chapters of Matthew are an interpolation. No translator of that early age could have so perfectly assimilated, in matter and manner, two different writers, unless he had a fixed and steady purpose of this nature, and intended to deceive his readers, by making them believe that there was but one original author. Even then we cannot suppose any translator of that day had skill enough to effect his purpose. Nor have we any evidence, either from the nature of the work, or from the credit attached to it, of any thing else than an honest and simple version; if indeed it be a *version*, and not an original.

I repeat my question, then, to Mr. Norton: How can two writers be so exactly alike, as the author of the two first, and the last twenty-six chapters of Matthew? It is against all that he has so truly and strikingly said, on pp. 78—82 of his work, respecting the marked peculiarities and differences of style between Mark, Luke, and John. Why has he been silent there, throughout this paragraph, on the characteristics of Matthew? Plainly they are not less marked, nor less uniform and general, than those of either of the other Evangelists. And this, I must add, is one of the most unaccountable of all circumstances, if the book in its present form be a translation—and a translation from two different authors.

I am constrained to believe, that Mr. Norton felt some pressure here; and he has managed this difficulty by keeping silence respecting the peculiar characteristics of Matthew, through the whole of this interesting section of Chap. II. Nor does what he has said of this Evangelist, on p. 90 seq., bring to view this topic.—But more of this anon. I return to the general course of argument.

In § 7 of this chapter, Mr. Norton has shewn, in a very happy manner, how every thing in the Gospels tallies with the times *when* and the places *where* they were composed; how difficult,

may impossible, it would be, for spurious and adulterated additions to preserve this concinnity ; and consequently, in case the Gospels had been tampered with as Eichhorn supposes, how easy it would be to detect this.

Near the close of the chapter, Mr. Norton presents us with a summary of what it contains ; which on account of its importance and the pleasing manner of it, should be here given to the reader.

We have seen then, in the present chapter, that there is no reason to doubt that the Christians of the first two centuries had the highest reverence for their sacred books ; and that with this sentiment, they could neither have made, nor have suffered, alterations in the Gospels ;—that the manner in which the Christian fathers speak of the corruptions with which they charged some of the heretics, implies, from the nature of the case, that they knew of no similar corruptions in their own copies of the Gospels ; — that from the notice which Origen takes of the various readings found by him in his manuscripts of the Gospels, we may conclude, that no considerable diversity among the manuscripts of the Gospels had ever existed ; — that we may infer the same from all the other notices respecting the text of the Gospels in the writings of the fathers ; and from the absence of any thing in their works, which might show, that their copies differed more from each other, than those now extant ; — that the peculiar style of the Gospels generally, and the uniform style of each Gospel, afford proof that each is, essentially, the work of one author, which has been preserved unaltered ;—that this argument becomes more striking, when we consider, that far the greater number of the copies of the Gospels, during the first two centuries, were made by Greek transcribers, who, if they had interpolated, would have interpolated in common Greek ; that it is from copies made by them that our own are derived ; but that the Gospels, as we possess them, are written, throughout, in that dialect of the Greek, which was used only by Jews ;—that spurious works, or spurious additions to genuine works, may commonly be discovered by some incongruity with the character or the circumstances of the pretended author, or with the age to which they are assigned ; but that with the exception, perhaps, of a few passages, the genuineness of which is doubtful, no such incongruity appears in the Gospels ;—and lastly, that the consistency preserved throughout each of the Gospels in all that relates to the actions, discourses, and most extraordinary character of Christ, shows that each is a work which remains the same essentially as it was originally written, uncorrupted by subsequent alterations and additions ; pp. 88—90.

The thetical part of this discussion being thus concluded, Mr.

Norton comes next to the consideration of the objections and difficulties that have been raised against such views as he has defended. He informs us, that 'strongly as the corruption of the Gospels has been asserted, he is unacquainted with any formal statement of arguments in its proof.'

To the statement which immediately follows, I desire to express my most unqualified assent and to record my warmest approbation. It is too good to be kept from the readers.

Those by whom it has been principally maintained, belong to that class of German critics, who reject the belief of any thing properly miraculous in the history of Christ. But the difficulty of reconciling this disbelief of the miracles with the admission of the truth of facts concerning him not miraculous, is greatly increased, if the Gospels be acknowledged as the uncorrupted works of those who were witnesses of what they relate, or who derived their information immediately from such witnesses. On the other hand, in proportion as suspicion is cast upon the genuineness and authenticity of those writings, the history of Christ becomes doubtful and obscure. An opening is made for theories concerning his life, character, and works, and the origin of his religion. Any account of our Saviour, upon the supposition that he was not a teacher from God, endued with miraculous powers, must be almost wholly conjectural. But such a conjectural account will appear to less disadvantage, if placed in competition with narratives of uncertain origin, than if brought into direct opposition to the authority of original witnesses; pp. 94—95.

Mr. Norton then has cleared himself here most explicitly and fully from the charge that has sometimes been made against him, viz. that he is a Naturalist, or a so called Rationalist of the lowest order. That the Saviour is a teacher from God, and endued with *miraculous* powers, is what he openly declares himself to believe; unless I have totally mistaken the drift of the above passage. But I should be slow to believe that I have; for whatever Mr. Norton's religious views may be, I apprehend that one of the last things justly chargeable against him would be, hypocrisy and double dealing. He would not speak as he here does, unless his belief were such as I have stated.

It may be proper, moreover, since I am upon this subject, to bring into view another passage in Mr. Norton's Note, p. LXII., which I have read with great, although not with unmingled satisfaction. The passage runs thus:

In regard to the main event related, the miraculous conception of Jesus, it seems to me not difficult to discern in it purposes worthy

of God. Nothing could have served more effectually to relieve him from that interposition and embarrassment in the performance of his high mission, to which he would have been exposed on the part of his parents, if born in the common course of nature. It took him from their control, and made them feel, that in regard to him they were not to interfere with the purposes of God. It gave him an abiding sense from his earliest years, that his destiny on earth was peculiar and marvellous; and must have operated most powerfully to produce that consciousness of his intimate and singular connexion with God, which was so necessary to the formation of the character he displayed, and to the right performance of the great trust committed to him. It corresponds with his office; presenting him to the mind of a believer, as an individual set apart from all other men, coming into the world with the stamp of God upon him, answerably to his purpose here, which was to speak to us with authority from God; Note, p. lxii.

I have said in respect to this last paragraph, that my satisfaction is not *unmingled*; and I have said this merely because this paragraph, while containing what I deem to be truth and nothing but truth, does not by any means contain what in my view is the *whole* truth, in respect to the Saviour's origin. His genetic history goes farther back, as I apprehend the subject, than Mr. Norton has here intimated. John has given it to us in his Gospel. "In the *beginning* was the Word." Mr. Norton, it would seem from the tenor of this paragraph, does not admit the *preexistence* of the Logos, and therefore has some mode of interpretation by which he gives quite another turn to the sense of John 1: 1 and other kindred passages, than that which is commonly assigned to them. But in what tolerable sense the *Logos became flesh and dwelt among us*, provided that no preexistence is assigned to him before conception in the womb of Mary, I have not yet seen made out. That Mr. Norton has some interpretation which seems admissible to his own mind, I doubt not. But he has nowhere told us in this volume what it is. Nor do I blame him for this. He did not design the volume to be an exposition of his theological creed, nor a book of theological polemics. I do not recollect that he has even once intimated, in the whole book, what his particular views are respecting the nature and rank of the Logos and of the Holy Spirit. It would be difficult, I believe, to make out from his Treatise any where, that Mr. Norton is a Unitarian; although those who are much conversant with doctrinal statements might conjecture this, on the ground that every declaration of

a positive nature, on this great subject, is carefully avoided. I suppose it probable, that Mr. Norton stands in sentiment respecting this matter, nearly in the position where Lardner stood; and like him, he has throughout his work carefully avoided every thing, in general, which would be justly offensive to any party in the Christian church. In a book like his, this is admissible, perhaps commendable. At least those who differ from the author of this book in regard to the rank of being in which the Saviour is to be placed, must allow him at least the praise of courtesy, inasmuch as he has said little or nothing on this subject which can justly offend them.

Most heartily can I go with Mr. Norton in the declarations above quoted, which have given rise to these remarks. As heartily can I go much farther; but I am not persuaded that I ought to find fault with him, because he has not taken occasion here to avow his whole creed. He was not obliged to do so; and the expediency of so doing should be committed to his own judgment.

But let us return to Mr. Norton's discussion of the objections against the genuineness of the Gospels. The principal difficulties that have of late been raised, have sprung, as he supposes, and probably with good reasons, from the theory of an *Original Gospel*, antecedent to our present Gospels, and the common source from which the Evangelists have all drawn.

This *Protevangelium*, however, did not itself remain unaltered. Every or any possessor of it, as Eichhorn and others suppose, made what additions or alterations he pleased, according as he was prompted to do this by traditional information, communicated either orally or by written documents which fell into his hands. The *Original Gospel*, then, when it came into the hands of the Evangelists, came in forms or editions (so to speak) which differed much from each other. The *primitive* text was indeed the basis; but the additions and emendations had very much changed the appearance and the contents of that text. Hence, as one Evangelist obtained one copy, and another fell upon a different one, and as all drew from their respective copies, so their agreement in very many instances can be accounted for, while the ground of their disagreement is at the same time apparent.

Will it be believed, in after generations, that such a theory as this could have spread far and wide in the Christian world, and that a great portion of the writers on the Gospels in Ger-

many for the last fifty years have defended, or at least admitted it? But what is still more, can one believe that such a theory should have been strenuously advocated in England, by no less a person than the translator of Michaelis, the present Lord Bishop of Peterborough? Yet such is the case. In whatever way we may account for it, we cannot doubt of the facts themselves. Writers of the graver cast, and such as do not mean to consider themselves as attached to Neology, have often admitted and built upon this theory. Thus we find Kuinoel, every where in his Commentary on the first three Gospels, appealing to the *Protevangelium* for the solution of difficulties and the explanation of apparent contrarieties.

Mr. Norton has judiciously reserved the discussion of this subject for the Notes subjoined to his work. He has done the same, in regard to several apocryphal Gospels which Eichhorn appeals to, as having existed antecedently to our present Gospels, and sprung from the same *Protevangelium*. I shall therefore dismiss the subject of them for the present, intending to resume it in the sequel, when I come to speak of the Notes in question. I would merely suggest here, with Mr. Norton (p. 94), that the whole theory rests, and must rest, upon mere *presumption*; for no Original Gospel, such as it assumes, was ever heard or spoken of, so far as we have any knowledge of Christian antiquity, among the churches of the primitive or early ages. But a mere presumption can not, on any proper grounds of estimating evidence, be admitted to outweigh the positive and abundant testimony to the genuineness of the present Gospels, which has been produced.

That the reader may see to what shifts the defenders of these multiplex Gospels are driven, I will produce a passage from our author in which this matter is briefly stated, and briefly, but conclusively, discussed.

It has been affirmed by Eichhorn, as a general truth, that "before the invention of printing, in transcribing a manuscript, the most arbitrary alterations were considered as allowable; since they affected only an article of private property, written for one's individual use." This statement, which, if correct, would destroy the credit of all ancient writings, seems to have been made through inadvertence; and therefore, though apparently a principal argument in defence of the supposed corruption of the Gospels, cannot be regarded as a proper subject for particular remark. It is important only as showing, that in attacking the genuineness of their text, one is un-

consciously led to assume principles which would equally prove the corruption of all other ancient works; p. 100.

The remainder of the first chapter is employed in discussing some allegations of Celsus, of a slanderous nature, against the Gospels. The answer which Mr. Norton makes is able and satisfactory.

The summary with which this first part of Mr. Norton's book is concluded, should be here presented by way of brief recapitulation.

“ It [the genuineness of the Gospels] appears from the essential agreement among the very numerous copies of these books, so diverse in their character, and in their mode of derivation from the original. This agreement among different copies could not have existed, unless some archetype had been faithfully followed : and this archetype, it has been shown, could have been no other than the original text. It appears from the reverence in which the Gospels were held by the early Christians ; and the deep sense which they had of the impropriety and guilt of making any alteration in those writings. It appears from the historical notices respecting their text, which are wholly inconsistent with the supposition of its having suffered essential corruptions. And, finally, it appears from the internal character of the books themselves, which show no marks of gross, intentional interpolation ; but, on the contrary, exhibit a consistency of style and conception, irreconcilable with the supposition of it ; pp. 107, seq.

Part II. presents us with *the evidence that the Gospels have been ascribed to their true authors.*

It is agreed on all hands, that at or near the close of the second century, the four Gospels were generally, or rather universally received in the church, with the exception of a party or parties of heretics. Mr. Norton therefore goes on to shew, that they were attributed to the then reputed authors during the time which preceded this, i. e. in the earliest ages of the church. This he does by appeal to all the leading early Christian writers ; some of them within the second century, and some of them just beyond its termination.

His quotations from Irenaeus, Theophilus of Antioch, Tertulian, Clement of Alexandria, Celsus the opposer of Christianity (about 176), and Origen, shew, in a manner past all contradiction, what was thought, said, and written, respecting the authors of the four Gospels, within the period of 160—230 or 240. Earlier evidence is produced in the sequel.

In the selection of his testimony, Mr. Norton is careful and judicious. He does not, like even Lardner, bring in every thing which he can find; but he appeals to a few direct, plain, unequivocal passages in each writer, which can leave no possible doubt on the mind what that writer's sentiments were respecting the point in question.

Would that many writers understood the business of selecting evidence much better than they appear to do! They are not contented with the principle, that 'at the mouth of two or three witnesses every matter may be established,' but they must have as many as they can summon, and of all sorts of character. Especially is this true of the appeals made to the Bible in defence of some particular doctrines. The texts that have once been adduced as evidence, no matter how unskillfully or how inconsistently with exegetical principles, are not to be given up, but always to be brought forward in a contest. *Numbers* seem to be regarded as more formidable than the kind of weapons, or skill to wield them. And all who from conscientious motives feel bound to refrain from going to such an extent in the quotation of testimonies, are regarded as secretly cherishing some heretical doubts or difficulties.

I can scarcely imagine any thing better adapted to revolt the mind of a simple and candid inquirer, than such a method of accumulating testimony. Nor can I conceive how any thing could be better adapted to gratify a wary opponent. If an advocate at the bar should summon twenty or thirty witnesses to prove the signing of a deed, or of a note of hand, or to establish almost any other fact, would not the very fact of summoning so many, strike the jury with suspicion? And would not his antagonist advocate exult in the opportunity of cross-examining twenty or thirty witnesses, who would be sure, if adroitly managed, to produce more or less of contradictions that would render the whole body of testimony suspicious?

Yet, plain as this matter seems to be, I am constrained to ask: When will it be understood, that a question in dispute is not to be decided by the *number*, but by the weight and quality, of the witnesses adduced? Mr. Norton, however, seems well to understand this matter, for he has conducted his investigations with due regard to it; and he has given much more weight to his book in consequence of so doing.

But it is not the testimony of the authors quoted, which is the only thing concerned with the question at issue. They

speaking not merely for themselves, but for the whole body of Christians at their time. Mr. Norton has so fine a passage on this subject, that it must be presented to the reader.

In estimating the weight of evidence, which has thus far been adduced, for the genuineness of the Gospels, it is important to keep in mind, what has not always been sufficiently attended to; that it is not the testimony of certain individual writers alone, on which we rely, important as their testimony might be. These writers speak for a whole community, every member of which had the strongest reasons for ascertaining the correctness of his faith respecting the authenticity, and, consequently, the genuineness of the Gospels. We quote the Christian fathers, not chiefly to prove their individual belief; but in evidence of the belief of the community to which they belonged. It is not, therefore, the simple testimony of Irenaeus, and Theophilus, and Tertullian, and Clement, and Origen, which we bring forward; it is the testimony of thousands and tens of thousands of believers, many of whom were as well informed as they were, on this particular subject, and as capable of making a right judgment. All these believers were equally ready with the writers who have been quoted, to affirm the authority and genuineness of the Gospels. The most distinguished Christians of the age, men held in high esteem by their contemporaries and successors, assert that the Gospels were received as genuine throughout the community of which they were members, and for which they were writing. That the assertion was made by such men, under such circumstances, is sufficient evidence of its truth. But the proof of the general reception of the Gospels does not rest upon their assertions only, though these can not be doubted. It is necessarily implied in their statements and reasonings respecting their religion. It is impossible that they should have so abundantly quoted the Gospels, as conclusive authority for their own faith, and that of their fellow Christians, if these books had not been regarded by Christians as conclusive authority. We cannot infer more confidently from the sermons of Tillotson and Clarke, the estimation in which the Gospels were held in their day, than we may infer from the writers before mentioned, that they were held in similar estimation during the period when they lived; pp. 133 seq.

He then goes on to shew how different this testimony is from that which is exhibited respecting any other ancient books, where individuals spoke only their own personal conviction, and not the sentiments of a whole community; also that early Christians had abundant means of determining the question about the genuineness of the Gospels; that their moral and even literary character was much elevated above that of the

mass of the heathen around them, and therefore they were more capable than was ordinary of judging in the premises ; while at the same time we have abundant evidence of their honesty and integrity. I would commend the whole of this excellent passage to the attentive perusal and consideration of every candid reader.

That early Christians did make inquiries respecting subjects of this nature, seems to be evident from the fact, that while all the spurious Gospels were rejected, the four canonical ones only were received. Nay, the matter of investigation went still further. Some of the books of the New Testament, viz. the second epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, Jude, and in a certain sense the epistle to the Hebrews, and at a later period the Apocalypse, were called in question by more or less of the churches, and were reckoned by Eusebius among the *ἀντιλεγόμενοι*. While this fact does not decide against the genuineness or authenticity of these books, it still serves to shew that early Christians were not such stupid and passive recipients of any and all kinds of writings and reports, as many Neologists would seem to consider them. At any rate, the books about which there never seems to have been any dispute in the church catholic, give us a pure and adequate account of Christianity in its history and in its precepts. Not that others are superfluous ; but what I mean is, that if the controverted books were even all laid aside, Christianity would still be in all substantial respects what it now is.

Mr. Norton, in order more effectually to remove all the difficulties and objections that lie in the way of the genuineness of the Gospels, has examined, in the next place, the theory which prevailed somewhat extensively before the time of Eichhorn, of the Gospels being derived from one another. Griesbach, for example, made a vigorous effort to shew, that Mark is the epitomator of Matthew and Luke ; while others have supposed that Luke made use of Matthew's Gospel, or Matthew of Luke's, or that some one of the three Evangelists copied from both his predecessors. Notwithstanding all the learning and ingenuity which have been expended on this subject, the difficulties with which it is pressed are overpowering. All the evidence that one Evangelist copied another, or others, lies in the simple fact of similarity, and sometimes even sameness, of expression and design, in the different Gospels. But while this, as Mr. Norton has most ably and satisfactorily shewn in his

Notes, actually extends to but a very small part of the Gospels, the dissimilarity, or rather, the peculiar characteristics entirely appropriate to each writer, extend over far the greater part of his work. This fact then is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of his being a plagiarist, a copyist, or at least a mere paraphrast. The advocates of such theories seem to have entirely forgotten, that the *discrepancies*, or (at any rate) the *dissimilarities*, between the Gospels, which in point of number and importance far exceed the *similarities*, are to be accounted for as well as their near resemblances. Nothing can be further from giving a probable account of this, than the supposition that any one Evangelist is a mere imitator, or *epitomator* (as the phrase is), of the others.

But Mr. Norton has brought other considerations to bear upon this subject, and I refer the reader to what he has said on pp. 152—155 of his work. In particular has he discussed the supposition, that any one of the Gospels was composed *after* the apostolic age, in the manner stated above. The estimation in which they were held, did not admit of their being so changed and remodelled.

The second theory which Mr. Norton examines, is, that the Gospels were composed from *written* documents existing previously to their composition. If such were the fact, then these were either alike or unlike; if *alike* how came the authors of the first three Gospels to differ so much from each other? If *unlike*, and yet in good repute, as they must have been in order to be adopted as sources of new Gospels, then how came the churches to cast away the old Gospels and receive the new ones? These and the like considerations Mr. Norton has urged in such a way as to render highly improbable the supposition, that written documents were the sources of our present Gospels.

A third supposition which he examines, is, that after the age of the apostles the present Gospels were composed from traditional accounts then in circulation among Christians. Had this been the case, they must have been much more discrepant than they now are, and doubtless would have been filled, like the apocryphal Gospels which are still extant, with silly and incredible narrations. Besides, Luke expressly states the fact, in his preface, that many attempts had already been made, to compose narrations concerning the things which Jesus said and did; so that, whenever his Gospel was written, it is manifest that

oral tradition was not at that time the only channel in which the history of Jesus had been conveyed down.

After this discussion, which is ably conducted throughout, the author comes next to inquire, how the *four* Gospels could first have gained the currency and authority which they did in the primitive church, unless they were genuine.

The improbability, I had almost said, the impossibility of this, is well exhibited in pp. 164 seq. of his work. Such a thing could not have taken place, during the lives of the apostles, as the reception of the Gospels attributed to them, unless this was well-grounded. Their own denial of the fact, would have destroyed the credit of the supposititious books. Let us suppose, then, that after their death the Gospels first made their appearance, with their present claims as to authorship; who would have admitted this claim, in case the books had not before been heard of? Or did the church expressly agree to authenticate these works, at a subsequent period? When and where was such a thing done, and when and how was it possible, at that period, that it should be done?

There is another view of this subject, which is certainly one of no small importance in the consideration of it. The present Gospels exhibited, from the first, many apparent discrepancies with each other. These were not overlooked by early Christians. In the second century, as we know from abundant testimony, strenuous efforts were made at conciliation. Origen is very full and ample, soon after the close of this century, on the subject of these discrepancies. He even magnifies them quite beyond the reality, in order that he might urge upon the churches his favorite method of allegorical interpretation. The greater the differences could be made, the higher the necessity, as he thought, of adopting his mode of exegesis.

With these facts in view, how can it well be accounted for, that the early churches did universally receive all four of the present Gospels? Had not their genuineness enforced this reception, nothing can be more natural than to suppose, that, like the Corinthian church in regard to their teachers, one party would prefer one Gospel and another party would receive another. Thus endless and wide-spread contest, instead of universal harmony, would have arisen among the early churches. This whole subject is amply and ably illustrated in pp. 167 seq. of our author's work.

Still another consideration he urges upon us. The Jewish

and Gentile parts of the Christian church had been much divided, even in the apostolic age, in regard to questions about the reception of the Mosaic law. This and other sources of dissension, so common and of so long standing between Jew and Gentile, instead of diminishing among the Palestine Jews, seem to have been augmented after the destruction of Jerusalem. The sects of the Ebionites and Nazarenes grew out of the Jewish party ; and to these the great body of Christians, at a very early period, became decidedly hostile. How then could the Gospels, the work of *Jews*, have been forced upon the reception of the Gentile Christians, after the division between the two parties became so marked and so permanently established ? Confessedly and plainly the Gospels flowed from a *Hebrew* source. If Luke and Mark were not Hebrews, (the probability is that they were of Hebrew descent, at least in part), still all antiquity unites in ascribing their Gospels mainly to the influence of Peter and Paul, and in supposing that these writings underwent their superintendence or revision. How then could the Gentile part of the church reject all other Gospels and receive our present canonical ones, which are of Hebrew origin, if it were not well and generally known, and believed without any doubt, that they are genuine ?

Mr. Norton urges these and other questions in a forcible manner, and well adapted to produce conviction. I hope the reader will not satisfy himself with the brief sketch that I have given of the nature of his argument, without perusing the original.

In the succeeding paragraph our author has a passage, which the reader will thank me for inserting here.

It is acknowledged that the four Gospels were received with the greatest respect, as genuine and sacred books, by catholic Christians, that is, by the great body of Christians, at the end of the second century. But earlier than this time, it has been pretended, that we find no trace of their existence ; and hence it has been inferred that before this time, they were not in common use and were but little known, even if extant in their present state. I shall hereafter produce notices of their existence at a much earlier period. But waving for the present this consideration, the reasoning appears not a little extraordinary. About the end of the second century, the Gospels were revered as sacred books by a community dispersed over the world, composed of men of different nations and languages. There were, to say the least, sixty thousand copies of them in existence ; they were read in the churches of Christians ; they were continually quoted, and appealed to, as of the highest authority ; their reputa-

tion was as well established among believers from one end of the Roman empire to the other, as it is, at the present day, among Christians in any country. But it is asserted that before that period, we find no trace of their existence; and it is, therefore, inferred that they were not in common use, and but little known, even if extant in their present form. This reasoning is of the same kind, as if any one were to say, that the first mention of Egyptian Thebes is in the poems of Homer. He, indeed, describes it as a city, which poured a hundred armies from its hundred gates; but his is the first mention of it, and, therefore, we have no reason to suppose, that before his time, it was a place of any considerable note. The general reception of the Gospels as books of the highest authority, at the end of the second century, necessarily implies their celebrity at a much earlier period, and the long continued operation of causes, sufficient to produce so remarkable a phenomenon; pp. 177 seq.

Further remarks, expanding, illustrating, and enforcing this view, are made in the sequel, which well deserve the reader's attention.

Chap. II. of Part II. is devoted to a discussion of the evidence respecting the authors of the Gospels, to be derived from the works of Justin Martyr, who flourished about 140—160, and who lived in Palestine, i. e. at Flavia Neapolis in Samaria, and was a native of that place, although of Gentile extraction. The question has been strenuously agitated, of late, whether Justin, who so often and largely quotes evangelical history, has quoted our present Gospels. The works to which he continually appeals, he designates by the title of *Ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, i. e. *Memoirs of the Apostles*. Into the examination of this subject Mr. Norton has gone deeply, and with great patience, and candor, and accuracy, brought out to our view all the substantial facts which are concerned in making up a judgment upon the question presented. Not content with the sixty pages in the body of his work, which are devoted to this interesting topic, the author has given us twenty-six more closely printed ones in his Notes (pp. ccvii. seq.), in which he has produced a multitude of passages from Justin, in order to illustrate and fortify his position, viz. that Justin did quote our present Gospels.

I deem his argument to be a triumphant one. It was moreover specially needed, after the recent and laboured attempt of Credner, to show that Justin has quoted a *Petrine Gospel*, and not any of our present canonical ones; although he is forced to concede that Justin was not unacquainted with the latter. Long

ago I came to the same conclusion which Mr. Norton has defended, by reading Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*. The discrepancies between his quotations and the passages in our Gospels which he designs to quote, have been laid hold of by Credner, and by many others before him, in order to shew that Justin must have appealed to some work different from our canonical Gospels. But what is that work? A Petrine Gospel; a Gospel according to the Hebrews; Memoirs of the Apostles (with this peculiar and appropriate title); and other like works, have been selected by some as the sources of Justin's quotations. But of all the so named books, (some of the names are but imaginary as actual titles), not one remains with which we can now compare Justin's quotations. How then can it be ascertained that he quoted from them?

If it be still urged, that the difference between Justin's quotations and the actual text of our Gospels is so great, that we *must* suppose him to have quoted some other books; the answer to this is, a denial of the fact, and an exhibition of reasons sufficient to constitute a stable ground on which we may rest this denial. Justin differs no more in his quotations from the Scriptures, than most of the early fathers do. This I know to be fact, from repeated examination of several of them in relation to this same matter. *Chapter and verse* did not exist, in his days, in the Mss. of the New Testament. The process of unrolling a Ms. in order to get at a particular passage so as to copy it verbatim, was a very tedious one compared with the process of finding any thing in our present printed volumes. There were no *Concordances* of the New Testament in those days. In a word, a man who was writing with fervour of mind could not, on any ordinary occasion, stop long enough to hunt out the exact places where particular texts occurred, in the midst of so many embarrassments which would occasion long delay. We must add to all this, that in the days of Justin, the memory was ordinarily trusted to and employed much more than at the present time. Hence we see every where, in the early fathers, *memoriter* quotations—a multitude indeed of them which are most palpably of such a nature, among authors who wrote, as all acknowledge, after the period when our four canonical Gospels were exclusively and generally admitted by the churches. On the ground that has served for an attack upon the quotations of Justin, those of Clemens Romanus, of Irenaeus, of Tertullian, of Clemens Alexandrinus and others, might be proscribed.

What proves so much, however, does not prove enough for the purposes of those who would reject the testimony of Justin in favour of our present canonical Gospels.

Besides, there is one simple test of this whole matter. Justin has repeatedly quoted the *same* passages from the Gospels *more than once*. Now in doing this, he has varied in the same way from himself as he has from the originals. This Mr. Norton has abundantly exhibited, by submitting to our inspection the various passages of Justin where this is done. The reader will find them in the Notes, pp. ccxx seq. He will also find passages quoted from the Old Testament by Matthew, with variations from the Septuagint version, in quoting which passages again Justin has followed the peculiarities of Matthew, and not of the original Greek or Hebrew Scriptures.

If any one doubts, after all, whether there is not some force in the argument of Credner and others in respect to the discrepancy between Justin's quotations and the Gospels, let him spend a few days in studying the quotations from the Scriptures, which exist in the works of the early Christian writers. I might even say: Let him peruse the New Testament, where he will find a discrepancy between the quotations from the Old Testament and the originals themselves, whether Greek or Hebrew, which is not much unlike that exhibited by Justin.

For these reasons I cannot doubt that Mr. Norton is in the right, in this very important matter; so clearly in the right, that, as it seems to my mind, no reasonable objections can be made against his conclusions.

At all events, the reader cannot fail to perceive, if he attentively peruses the views which Mr. Norton has given us in relation to this subject, that he has bestowed great pains and labour upon the consideration of it, and that his conclusion is not to be rejected on the bare ground of hypothesis, or for the sake of establishing some favorite theory.

In justice to the labour which Mr. Norton has expended on this subject, I ought to give a passage from him which states his reasons for it.

The examination of the passages which we have gone over, is of more interest than may appear at first sight. Justin carries us back to the age which followed that of the apostles. His writings have been searched for the purpose of finding some notices of Christ, or some intimations relating to him, different from the accounts of the evangelists. It will be perceived that nothing which can be regarded

as of any importance has been discovered. On the contrary, he gives a great part of the history of Christ, in perfect harmony with what is found in the Gospels, sometimes agreeing in words, and always in meaning. We may infer, therefore, that the account of Christ, contained in the Gospels, was that which his followers had taught, and had received, as true, from the beginning; that it was the account which Christians acknowledged as the foundation of their faith; and that there were no opposing narratives respecting him, which disappeared in part, and in part coalesced into the forms which the four Gospels present. It is remarkable, that in so early a writer as Justin, we discover so little matter, additional to what is contained in the Gospels; so little, which it is necessary to suppose derived from any other source. The most satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon seems to be, that the Gospels had come down from the apostolic age with such a weight of authority, there was such an entire reliance upon their credibility, that it was generally felt to be unwise and unsafe to blend any uncertain accounts with the history contained in these works. Such accounts, therefore, were neglected and forgotten. The Gospels extinguished all feebler lights; pp. 222 seq.

All there is to meet such an array of proof in favour of the position that Justin quoted our canonical Gospels, is the *supposition* that he quoted the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* or the *Petrine Gospel*, as Credner is fond of naming it. But in Justin's day this Gospel, whatever it was, seems to have existed only in *Hebrew*, so far as we can gather from ancient testimony. Now there is little or no probability that Justin made use of a Hebrew Gospel. All his quotations of the Old Testament shew that he used the Septuagint version, and not the Hebrew Scriptures. And so in respect to the New Testament. He quotes passages, for example, from Matthew and Luke, where these Evangelists do not agree exactly either with the Septuagint or with the original Hebrew, and in these quotations Justin exhibits the peculiarities of the Evangelists in distinction from both of the originals. Now, even if we suppose Justin to have well understood the Hebrew, and to have translated from it in his Old Testament quotations, how can we suppose, with any degree of probability, that his translation would minutely accord with the peculiarities of Luke or of Matthew?

There can be no doubt that Justin, living as he did at Flavia Neapolis, and surrounded as he was by those who spoke the later Hebrew, must have had some good understanding of the conversation-Hebrew of his day. But it would be difficult indeed, to find in all his works any traces of a literary or critical

knowledge on his part, of the Hebrew. The instance of his *etymologizing* in regard to the word *Σατάν*, produced by Mr. Norton in a Note on p. 226, is amusing, and instructive with respect to the point in question. He says, that *Σατάν* signifies *apostate*, in the language of the Jews and Syrians; and—*σαῖς* (the Greek case-ending of the word) means a *serpent* = *ἔχιν*, (pronounced with a feeble sound of the *π*, which was often the case with the ancients). Such an etymology he must have obtained, one would naturally suppose, from some Jewish Rabbi who meant to impose upon his credulity. The slightest grammatical knowledge of the Hebrew must have taught him that neither part of such an explanation is correct; and that the latter part is even ridiculous.

It is not probable, therefore, that Justin used the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*; nor even that he used the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, if that were indeed extant and in circulation at his time. The proofs that he used the Gospel of Matthew as it now is, are indeed unanswerable; for he has copied some peculiarities of it, which we cannot rationally suppose would have been adopted by accident.

I am aware that Credner supposes the *Petrine Gospel*, which he thinks was quoted by Justin, to have existed at a very early period; and also that the real Gospel of Matthew and this fictitious one, or at any rate the Gospel according to the Hebrews, were alike as to the peculiarities in question. It is, indeed, a very convenient and easy way of getting rid of difficulties, when we are at liberty to imagine any kind of facts which are adapted to our purpose, and then conclude that they must have actually existed, because they dispose of our difficulties so happily. This, at all events, is one of Credner's ways of getting himself out of trouble. He is undoubtedly a man of great industry and of much reading, but of a strong bias in favour of his own theories, and filled to the brim with them. His book affords much useful material for more sober and judicious writers, and he is often striking and original in his remarks; but he lacks—egregiously lacks—the *Bedachtsamkeit* of such men as Morus, Ernesti, and the younger Tittmann.

It would seem then to be quite probable, if not altogether certain, from the circumstances above exhibited, that Justin did not quote the Gospel according to the Hebrews. What then did he quote? In answer to this I must present a paragraph from Mr. Norton.

If it be still denied that he used our present Gospels, then, in regard to any other single book, which he may be conjectured to have quoted, it must answer to the following conditions. It must have been one which he and other Christians believed, or professed to believe, "written by apostles and companions of apostles;" it must have been of high authority among Christians, a sacred book, read in their churches; and it must, immediately after he wrote, have fallen into entire neglect and oblivion; for no mention of it, or allusion to it, is discoverable in any writer who succeeded him. But it is impossible to believe all these propositions to be true of any book.

Excepting the Gospels, therefore, no history of Christ can be named, or imagined with any probability, which Justin might have used. The presumption, then, arising from the coincidence of his quotations with the text of the Gospels, is left to operate with its whole force; pp. 230 seq.

In the sequel Mr. Norton proceeds to adduce various testimonies from Justin, which serve both to show that he quoted our canonical Gospels, and to confirm the fact that they were regarded by him as undoubtedly genuine.

In particular should it be noted here, as a fact which is of much importance, that Eusebius, who quotes so many ecclesiastical writers that preceded him, and makes it a point to produce any thing peculiar or striking in them, although he gives a full account (for him) of Justin and his writings, *says not a word of his quoting any spurious Gospels*; while at the same time he tells us, that Hegesippus, the contemporary of Justin, appeals to the Gospel of the Hebrews. It is quite clear, therefore, that Eusebius did not consider Justin as making such an appeal.

When, in addition to all this, we call to mind that Justin speaks of the books to which he appeals for his evangelical history, as being counted sacred, as read in the assemblies of Christians on the Lord's day in connection with the Old Testament, and other like things, there does not seem to be much room for even suspicion that Justin did not quote our present Gospels.

Mr. Norton then sums up his discussion in the following manner:

The argument urged in the last chapter is, in its nature, cumulative; and the accession of force to be derived from the evidence afforded by the writings of Justin Martyr is not to be disregarded. He carries us one step higher in our advances toward the apostolic age. What was before a matter of inference, it may be thought of

necessary inference, becomes a matter of testimony. We learn directly from his writings, that the Gospels were received by Christians of his age, that is by those Christians, during the first half of the second century, as the authentic and sacred records of the history of their master, the works of his apostles and their companions.

Finally Mr. Norton makes the appeal to the testimony of Papias, as recorded by Eusebius, and to that of Luke himself as exhibited in Acts 1: 1, 2. Papias expressly mentions the Gospels of Matthew and Mark; and Luke appeals, in the passage to which reference is made above, to a Gospel that had been composed by himself. Thus is testimony carried back to the very age of the apostles; and if any credit is due to it, it is decisive. Can any one produce a good reason why it should not be credited?

Mr. Norton does not appeal to the first Epistle of Clemens Romanus, (to the second which is undoubtedly spurious he could not appeal), nor to the Epistle of Polycarp to the Ephesians, nor to the Shepherd of Hermas, nor to the Epistles of Barnabas or Ignatius. The two last of these are of such doubtful authority, that an appeal would be out of place in such a book as his, unless he had the intention of collecting together every thing, whether strong or weak, apposite or inapposite. As to the Shepherd of Hermas, there is no satisfactory evidence that it quotes any portion of the Gospels. But in respect to the Epistles of Clement of Rome and of Polycarp, there is room to doubt, inasmuch as the genuineness of them in general cannot be fairly called in question, whether Mr. Norton has judged well in omitting the evidence from them. He has, indeed, given us his reasons for so doing, in § VII. p. cclxxxiv. of his Addenda. But I am not fully satisfied with them, although I acknowledge that they deserve very serious consideration.

Mr. Norton alleges that the Gospels are not *named* in these writings; and although there are passages in them which accord with some portions of the Gospels, yet they may have sprung from *traditionary* reports, and not from *written* documents. Consequently, as he thinks, it would only weaken his cause to rely on arguments which might be of dubious efficacy. Some one might say, when appeal was made to these writers, that they who lived so near to the apostles, or rather, who were contemporary with them, might have drawn their quotations from other sources than those of our canonical Gospels.

This caution on the part of Mr. Norton is certainly much

better than the opposite practice of heaping together all sorts of testimony, good and bad, and leaving it to the readers to separate the wheat from the chaff. But I would suggest here, whether Mr. Norton has fairly been consistent with himself. Justin Martyr does not *name* any of our Gospels. He lived, moreover, so near the time of the apostles, that he must have been familiarly acquainted with some of their contemporaries, and have heard from them many accounts of the apostles' preaching and conversation. From these he *may* have quoted many a passage, perhaps most passages, which Mr. Norton regards as taken from the Gospels. Yet Mr. Norton, and with good reason, pleads strongly for the admission of Justin as a legitimate witness in the cause which he is advocating. So would I plead for Clement of Rome. There are things, no doubt, foisted into his Epistle, in some later age; yet they stand out as altogether different from the body of his work, and are as plainly spurious as the three famous passages of a confessedly spurious origin, which have been foisted into the Gospels, and which Mr. Norton exhibits on p. xcv. seq. of his Addenda. But the body of the epistle is of a sober, solid, affectionate cast, not profound, indeed, but still edifying to the primitive Christians, and adapted to persuade.

That Clement does not *name* the books of the New Testament, is clear enough. But is it not equally so, that he does not name the books of the Old Testament? He does, indeed, call some of the prophets by name, but as *individuals* he mentions their names, not as books. Chapters, verses, titles, i. e. running titles, I take to be all of modern origin. Certainly the now usual *titles* of the Gospels betray an origin quite subsequent to the primitive age. *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ . . .* is not the way in which an author would usually, if at all, make out his own title. It must have arisen from a later Redactor, who, seeing there were *four* books that all claimed to be Gospels, and all of which were acknowledged to be so, distinguished them by a *κατὰ* before the names, which seems to express the following sense, viz., *the Gospel as it is presented or represented by Matthew, etc.* Still, I am aware that the Greek writers sometimes used *κατὰ* before the names of authors, yet not simply in the way of designating a mere title; see Kuinoel, Comm. Vol. I. Proleg. § 2. All things considered, however, nothing can be more plain to my own mind, than that the usual running titles of our Gospels were not in the Mss. of

Justin's day, nor, of course, in that of Clemens Romanus ; and this is a sufficient reason why the names of respective Gospels are not familiarly appealed to, as in our day.

I will not say, however, that there is as much reason to rely on Clement as a witness in the case before us, as on Justin ; because the former lived much nearer the source of authentic *tradition*, than the latter, and may have oftener appealed to it. But still, when I compare, as I have done more than once, all the quotations by Clement from the Old Testament, with those which he adduces from the New, I can perceive no important difference in either case as to the modes of quotation, and I am led to believe, that in general he drew in both cases alike from written sources. This will not exclude the belief, at the same time, that now and then a passage occurs, which has come down, like some of Paul's quotations of the Saviour's words, by *oral* communication. I doubt not that such is the case with some of Justin's quotations. But why such an advantage should be taken of this, by Credner, Eichhorn, and others, is a different question. They doubtless had their reasons for so doing. But I should deem it to be just as reasonable for me to say, that in Paul's time there was a Gospel different from our four in circulation, because he appeals to the words of our Lord, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," as well known and familiar to the churches, which words are not in any of the canonical Gospels.

Mr. Norton, then, as it seems to me, might have safely and soundly admitted the testimony of Clement of Rome, with the simple abatement to its validity, that it is somewhat more possible, if not probable, in his case, than in that of Justin Martyr, that *oral* tradition might be the source of appeal.

Here ends the text of the first volume of Mr. Norton's important work. He tells us, (very gladly do we hear it after what he has already written), that he shall next examine the evidence in favour of the genuineness of the Gospels, which may be inferred from the use of them by the earlier *heretical sects*. I doubt not that much land here remains to be possessed ; and I trust Mr. Norton will give us an accurate and intelligible survey of it.

Thus much for the text of Mr. Norton's book, including several of the Notes which could not well be disjoined in our view of subjects discussed. But his Addenda or Notes comprise a much greater body of matter than the text ; for they

take up 290 pages of small print, while the text occupies only 248 of pica type. Some account must therefore be given of the Notes ; in regard to which one may truly say, that they are scarcely of less importance than the text itself. Some of them are indeed even of a higher cast than any of the text ; for they comprise the result of more severe, extended, and protracted effort, and of higher intellectual exertion. After saying thus much, the reader will naturally expect me to exhibit some adequate reasons for such opinion.

The Notes commence with an examination of Griesbach's celebrated theory, respecting the Western, the Alexandrian, and the Byzantine classes or (as he names them) *recensions* of Mss. It is well known that he considered this theory as fundamental in judging of the text of the New Testament ; for the goodness of a reading is not estimated by him according to the number of Mss., nor yet according to their antiquity merely, but very much by the authority of the class or recension to which it belongs.

Griesbach affirms, that these respective classes of Mss. are so diverse from each other, and each so distinctly marked in its own way, that it is altogether an easy matter at once to separate and distinguish them. Of the Western text, as exhibited in Tertullian and Cyprian, he says that " it differs *toto suo habitu universoque colore*, i. e. in its whole costume and entire colouring, from that which was used by Origen."

The first object of Mr. Norton is, to examine the correctness of this allegation. After giving a brief but lucid statement of the principal sources on which Griesbach relies in order to establish his classification, and of the respective characteristics which he assigns to each, Mr. Norton proceeds to compare what this learned critic has said, in different passages of his works, in relation to more or less Mss. of these classes. The *argumentum ad hominem* has seldom been used with more dexterity or to better effect, than Mr. Norton has here employed it. In a word, he plainly exposes the learned critic to the charge of frequent and great oversights in relation to this subject, of fluctuating opinion, and finally of absolute and downright self-contradiction.

Thus much for the *consistency* of Griesbach's views. Mr. Norton, however, does not stop here. He goes on to show how difficult, rather how impossible, it is to establish a theory like that of Griesbach, from facts as they lie before us. It is wonderful, indeed, how widely the views of Griesbach have

been propagated, in relation to the subject of classifying Mss. Soon after his theory was broached, an examination of it was commenced on the part of some. Yet their efforts do not appear to have been generally recognized. Matthaei attacked this *lusus naturae* of criticism very soon after its birth, and dealt out some rough and heavy blows which made it stagger. Eichhorn followed up in some good measure and seconded his efforts, to the still farther annoyance of this ill-starred progeny. Dr. Laurence struck through and through the very vitals of it, and let out its heart's blood; (Remarks on the Systemat. Classiff. of Mss. by Griesbach). Others of less name dug the grave and decently buried it. But Mr. Norton has disinterred its remains, burned them to ashes, and scattered these to the four winds of heaven. May there never arise from them any phoenix-like *γέννημα*, which shall cost the critical world as much trouble to hunt it down, as the original monster has done!

No where in his whole work does Mr. Norton appear to more advantage, than in canvassing the subject before us. In order that the reader may have a specimen of the nature of the subject and of the reasoning employed, I must present him with a passage from Mr. Norton, and from Dr. Laurence as quoted by him.

The quotations of Origen afford, according to Griesbach, the highest standard of comparison for the Alexandrine class. But respecting these quotations, Dr. Laurence remarks as follows; "In order to ascertain the true character of the readings of Origen, the whole of them together, and not a partial selection, should be examined. With this impression, I have given all which a diligent investigation enabled me to discover, in the Epistles of St. Paul, and have noted those which agree with other Alexandrine authorities, or with the Western, or with both. The total amount of his readings is *six hundred and nine*, out of which there are *two hundred and twenty-six*, which coincide with either Western or Alexandrine authority, or with both. Of the remainder, many, indeed, not unfrequently accord with the Byzantine, but many more are perfectly insulated." "But, notwithstanding the great amount of this incongruous remainder, there are found a sufficient number of congruous readings for the purpose, at least, of a comparative examination."

"There occur *two hundred and twenty-six*, which coincide with one or both of the classes alluded to. Of these, *one hundred and eighteen* are supported by Western authority alone, *ninety* by both Western and Alexandrine united, and *only eighteen* by Alexandrine alone. Supposing the existence of an Alexandrine text, we may

presume that Origen would frequently have associates of that description in *peculiar* readings; but this presumption is far from being warranted by fact. For in truth, the very reverse takes place; as, out of *two hundred and twenty-six* readings, Origen has but *eighteen* distinguishable from the Western text, in which he is joined by any other Alexandrine Father. Nor even in this limited number of *eighteen*, does he read in conjunction with more than *one* Alexandrine, (sometimes with Clemens, and sometimes with Cyril,) except in the following five instances: Rom. iii. 30; 1 Cor. iv. 13; viii. 8; Ephes. v. 25; Philip. i. 24; in which he receives a double support. On the other hand, his alliance with Western authority, in exclusion of the Alexandrine, is so intimate, that he reads with that alone, not *eighteen*, but *one hundred and eighteen times*, a full moiety of the whole amount. Neither does he here often read with one or two, but generally (the source indeed being more prolific) with numerous associates."

Besides Origen, Clement of Alexandria is another of Griesbach's principal Alexandrine authorities. Of Clement, however, he himself thus speaks in his last work: "I readily concede, that he often quoted passages of the New Testament from the Western edition, and agrees wonderfully (*et consentire mirum in modum*) with the Cambridge manuscript. But he agrees also not unfrequently (*non raro consonat*) with manuscripts of the Alexandrine text, the Vatican, Ephrem, and Codex Stephani η ; and this not only in passages where they give the same reading with the Cambridge manuscript, but in passages also where the Alexandrine authorities differ from the Western." It may appear, from all that has been quoted, that Clement and Origen, though put forward as leaders in the cause, are but doubtful Alexandrines, and well disposed to go over to the enemy; or rather that they are both open traitors. More seriously, it is evident that there is no ground for distinguishing under the name *Alexandrine*, or in any other manner, the text which appears in their quotations from the text found in certain other authorities called *Western*; pp. xii seq.

The reader needs only to be reminded, in order fully to understand the nature of the representation in the last paragraph of this extract, that the Cambridge Ms. or Codex Bezae is regarded as a leading authority in the supposed peculiar readings of what is called the *Western Recension*.

I have already quoted so much of Mr. Norton's book as almost to expose myself to a legal charge of republication without the liberty of the author. For the future, therefore, I must retrench, however unwillingly I may do it, for the sake of keeping within the more appropriate bounds of a reviewer.

I may with great propriety add, that I earnestly hope none of my readers will be content with the meagre account I have now given of Mr. Norton's masterly Note, on the subject of Griesbach's *recensions*. The contradiction of himself by Griesbach, his wavering opinions, his repeated modifications, and, finally his virtual abandonment of his own former system, in his latest work, i. e. his *Commentarius Criticus*, are all exemplified briefly, but plainly and in a most convincing manner.

Hug's *recensions*, too, come in, and very deservedly, for a part of Mr. Norton's attention. He examines the alleged theory of the recensions of Lucian and Hesychius, and shews how entirely destitute it is of any ancient testimony which is at all adapted to establish it. In particular, I do not see how Mr. Norton's construction of the famous passage in Jerome, cited on p. xxvii., and which has been used for the support of the above named recensions, can be met and refuted. I cannot entertain a doubt that he has given the proper and the only intelligible construction, which can be put upon the original as it stands in the text of Jerome.

I can present only a few sentences more from our author's Note on the subject of Mss., which will give the reader the gist of his conclusion.

From what has been said, I think it evident, that the appearances in our authorities for settling the text of the New Testament afford no countenance to the theory of recensions, maintained by Griesbach and other critics; that there is no ground for a distinction between an Alexandrine and a Western text, of which Griesbach represents the difference as so great, and that the peculiarities of the Byzantine text may be explained without recourse to the supposition of a recension. The hypothesis is equally destitute of historical evidence; yet it is incredible that we should not have found in ancient authors frequent mention of those supposed recensions, if they had actually been made. So far from this, however, their existence is inconsistent with the few notices respecting the history of the text of the New Testament, contained in the writers of the first four centuries; p. xxxii.

Jerome, in the Preface to his Latin translation of the Gospels, says that he had corrected the errors before existing in the Latin copies by comparing together Greek manuscripts, that is, he proceeds to say, *ancient* manuscripts. Not a passage has been produced from any Christian writer of antiquity which speaks of a standard corrected text as of authority; nothing, answering to the abundant mention in modern writers of the corrected texts of Gries-

bach, Koppe, and others ; nor is there a notice of any collection and comparison of the various readings of the New Testament, or of any book of the New Testament.

We may conclude, then, that all our present authorities for settling the text of the New Testament are to be referred to the original text, as their nearer or more remote standard, without the intervention of such recensions as have been supposed. This conclusion is important in regard to the history and criticism of the text of the New Testament, and especially as strengthening our confidence, which the theory of Griesbach is adapted to weaken, in the genuineness and authority of such a corrected text as we have at the present day ample means of forming ; pp. xxxiii seq.

Most sincerely do I hope that this Note of Mr. Norton's will grow up into a little *book*, on the highly important subject which he has here discussed. So much attention to it as he has already paid, has fitted him for the composition of such a book as I have named ; in which he should not only dissipate, as he has here done, the illusions of the *classifiers*, but shew *how*, *why*, and *wherein*, the various critical editions of the New Testament already before the public have erred in the estimation of their authorities, by which they have decided the worth of various readings. Some sensible and useful hints on this great subject, Mr. Norton will find to aid him in Schott's *Isagoge*, and in the preface to his volume of *Comm. in Gal. et I. II. Thess.* Such a volume, conducted in the spirit and with the ability of the Note that has now been considered, is a desideratum in English sacred literature, and would be one of the most important favors that Mr. Norton could bestow on the republic of letters.

The third section of Note A. brings before the reader the subject of the various readings of the Greek text of the New Testament, considered in relation to their *character* and *importance*.

When the critical edition of the New Testament by Mill was published, it was discovered, that the Mss. which had been compared, afforded about 30,000 variations from the *Textus Receptus*, i. e. the common or usual text of the Greek Testament. Since that period, the number of various readings has been greatly augmented by new comparisons, and amounts, at present, to more than 100,000.

The subject was in a manner new, when Mill published his work, and it took strong hold upon the public feeling. One portion of the community were struck with horror at the idea that there were 30,000 variations from the received text, in

other authorities which were claimed as of equal or greater weight than belonged to the Mss. from which the *Textus Receptus* had been published. Even Whitby, enlightened as he was, and liberal enough, to be sure, in his *theological* notions, felt himself impelled by a proper regard to the authority and credit of the New Testament, to write a book against Mill's *various readings*; and from the manner of his book, there can be no doubt that he thought himself to be 'doing God service,' while performing his task. But, on the other hand, skeptics were filled with exultation, inasmuch as they deemed the credit of the New Testament writings to be destroyed, by such a numberless host of variations and contradictions.

Collins among the infidels, who was by no means an inferior sort of a man, gave vent to his feelings on this occasion. This called forth from Richard Bentley his famous *Remarks on Free Thinking*, in which is a passage extracted by Mr. Norton, of so deep an interest and of such great worth, that I should do injustice to my readers, and to the subject and the occasion also, if I omitted the presentation of it.

Mr. Norton remarks, that the number of *various readings* in the New Testament is probably less in proportion, than in most of the classic authors; which, if it be correct, (and we are going to see that it is), gives us more confidence in the genuineness of the New Testament text than in that of the great body of the classic writers. In justification of this remark Mr. Norton cites a passage from the book of Bentley that has just been named, which runs as follows:

"Terence is now in one of the best conditions of any of the classic writers; the oldest and best copy of him is now in the Vatican library, which comes nearest to the poet's own hand; but even that has hundreds of errors, most of which may be mended out of other exemplars, that are otherwise more recent and of inferior value. I myself have collated several, and do affirm that I have seen twenty thousand various lections in that little author, not near so big as the whole New Testament; and am morally sure, that if half the number of manuscripts were collated for Terence with that niceness and minuteness which has been used in twice as many for the New Testament, the number of the variations would amount to above fifty thousand.

"In the manuscripts of the New Testament, the variations have been noted with a religious, not to say superstitious exactness. Every difference in spelling, in the smallest particle or article of speech, in the very order or collocation of words without real change, has

been studiously registered. Nor has the text only been ransacked, but all the ancient versions, the Latin vulgate, Italic, Syriac, Æthiopic, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, Gothic, and Saxon; nor these only, but all the dispersed citations of the Greek and Latin Fathers in a course of five hundred years. What wonder then, if with all this scrupulous search in every hole and corner, the varieties rise to thirty thousand? when in all ancient books of the same bulk, whereof the manuscripts are numerous, the variations are as many or more, and yet no versions to swell the reckoning.

“The editors of profane authors do not use to trouble their readers, or risk their own reputation, by an useless list of every small slip committed by a lazy or ignorant scribe. What is thought commendable in an edition of Scripture, and has the name of fairness and fidelity, would in them be deemed impertinence and trifling. Hence the reader not versed in ancient manuscripts is deceived into an opinion, that there were no more variations in the copies, than what the editor has communicated. Whereas, if the like scrupulousness was observed in registering the smallest changes in profane authors, as is allowed, nay required in sacred, the now formidable number of thirty thousand would appear a very trifle.

“It is manifest that books in verse are not near so obnoxious to variations as those in prose; the transcriber, if he is not wholly ignorant and stupid, being guided by the measures, and hindered from such alterations as do not fall in with the laws of numbers. And yet even in poets the variations are so very many as can hardly be conceived without use and experience. In the late edition of Tibullus by the learned Mr. Broukhuse, you have a register of various lections in the close of that book; where you may see at the first view that they are as many as the lines. The same is visible in Plautus set out by Paræus. I myself, during my travels, have had the opportunity to examine several manuscripts of the poet Manilius; and can assure you that the variations I have met with are twice as many as all the lines of the book.”—pp. 93—95, 8th Ed.

To take a few books immediately at hand, I perceive by a loose computation from a table at the end of Wakefield's Lucretius, that he has collected about twelve thousand various readings of that author (exclusive of mere differences of orthography), from five printed copies only. Weiske's edition of Longinus presents more than three thousand various readings of the Treatise on the Sublime, a work of about the length of the Gospel of Mark, collected from eight manuscripts and two early editions. And Bekker has published *variations from his text* of the writings contained in his edition of Plato, which fill seven hundred and seventy-eight crowded octavo pages, and amount to I know not how many more than sixty thousand; the manuscripts used on each of the different writings being on an average about thirteen. The various readings of the New

Testament, it is to be remembered, have been collected from a very great number of manuscripts of the original, manuscripts of numerous ancient versions in which it is not to be supposed that the translator always rendered in a manner scrupulously literal, and also from the citations of a long series of Fathers, who, we know, were not commonly attentive to verbal accuracy in quoting ; pp. xxxv. seq.

This is a long extract, I admit, but it would be dealing unfaithfully with the readers of this Miscellany to omit a passage of such transcendent practical importance as this. Every man instinctively feels his faith in the New Testament strengthened, when he can find assurance, as he does here, that its text has not been treated with less, but with more, care than that of almost any ancient book whatever. For myself I do most sincerely thank Dr. Bentley and Mr. Norton for these excellent passages.

That part of our public, (and this is by far the greater portion), who have no practical acquaintance with the copying or printing of books, are hardly able to estimate how numerous the little variations in books will become, unless an extreme care is taken which the hurry of business will not often permit. Mr. Norton declares that there is no hazard in saying, that in our usual version of the Scriptures, there are, in the printed copies since the first edition in King James's time, variations which may be reckoned by tens of thousands ; and if we are to compare the quotations of the Bible by various writers, as has been done in respect to the New Testament in order to obtain various readings, we might safely compute them at hundreds of thousands. I cannot doubt the correctness of his statement, after the experience which I have had in comparisons of this nature.

But while this wears a formidable appearance to such as are not conversant with these matters, it will be found, when thoroughly investigated, to be on the whole quite a harmless affair. I cannot illustrate and confirm this declaration better than to quote the words of Mr. Norton.

I proceed then to observe, that, of the various readings of the New Testament, nineteen out of twenty, at least, are to be dismissed at once from consideration,—not on account of their intrinsic unimportance,—that is a separate consideration,—but because they are found in so few authorities, and their origin is so easily explained, that no critic would regard them as having any claim to be inserted in the

text. Of those which remain a very great majority are entirely unimportant. They consist in different modes of spelling; in different tenses of the same verb or different cases of the same noun, not affecting the essential meaning; in the use of the singular for the plural, or the plural for the singular, where one or the other expression is equally suitable; in the insertion or omission of particles, such as $\alpha\iota$ and $\delta\epsilon$, not affecting the sense, or of the article in cases equally unimportant; in the introduction of a proper name, where if not inserted, the personal pronoun is to be understood, or of some other word or words expressive of a sense which would be distinctly implied without them; in the addition of "Jesus" to "Christ" or "Christ" to "Jesus"; in the substitution of one synonymous or equivalent term for another; in the transposition of words leaving their signification the same; in the use of an uncompounded verb, or of the same verb compounded with a preposition, the latter differing from the former only in a shade of meaning; and in a few short passages, liable to the suspicion of having been copied into the Gospel where we find them from some other Evangelist. Such various readings, and others equally unimportant, compose far the greater part of all, concerning which there may be or has been a question, whether they are to be admitted into the text or not, and it is therefore obviously of no consequence in which way the question has been or may be determined; pp. xxxviii. seq.

Mr. Norton then proceeds to shew in what way we may, almost with certain success, detect any considerable passages in the Textus Receptus which are of spurious origin. Some such he believes there are. He mentions *three* which he deems to be of this character, that have been regarded as having relation to the doctrine of the Trinity. But of these he particularizes only 1 John 5: 7. I suppose the other two are 1 Tim. 3: 16, $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma \epsilon\varphi\alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\theta\eta \kappa. \tau. \lambda.$, and Acts 20: 28, "Feed *the church of God*," etc., where $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is the common reading, and $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ is the one more recently preferred by most critics. The first passage of these three seems to be plainly destitute of the critical evidence requisite to establish it; the second, as Dr. Henderson in his Essay upon it has most clearly shewn, has an overwhelming mass of testimony in its favour; and the third ($\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$) I would gladly view as a *textus emendandus*, and cheerfully substitute $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ for $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, inasmuch as $\alpha\dot{\iota}\mu\alpha \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (which the common reading would imply) is an expression utterly foreign to the Bible. A *God* whose blood was shed, must surely be a $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ as the Arians would have it, and not the impassible and eternal God, which I believe the Logos to be.

The value of all the immense labour which has been bestowed on the lower criticism of the New Testament, is not to be estimated, then, by any important new light which has been thrown by it upon the doctrines or facts which pertain to our holy religion. Not one new doctrine is brought to light ; not one old one shaken ; and no important fact is varied, or even obscured, by all that criticism has done. I speak now of what I believe to have been the actual result of criticism, on stable grounds of evidence ; not of some results to which some critics have now and then laid claim. For even Mr. Norton has cut off from us the two first chapters of Matthew, (not to speak of other and smaller passages), which certainly would be taking from the circle of our credence some important, or at any rate highly interesting, matters of fact. How far he may be deemed correct in his view of this case, I shall, if providence permit, endeavour to examine at a future time.

Mr. Norton makes a very brief but judicious summary of what has been achieved by the labours of lower criticism.

All those [improvements in the New Testament text] of any importance might have been made at a much less cost. Its chief and great value consists in establishing the fact, that the text of the New Testament has been transmitted to us with remarkable integrity ; that far the greater part of the variations among different copies are of no authority or no importance ; and that it is a matter scarcely worth consideration, as regards the study of our religion and its history, whether, after making a very few corrections, we take the Received Text formed as it was, or the very best which the most laborious and judicious criticism might produce ; p. xl.

In order to afford the most ample means of satisfaction in respect to what criticism has achieved, Mr. Norton presents his readers with a synopsis of all the various readings which Griesbach has thought worthy of notice, in the first eight chapters of Matthew. These are placed in one column, and the received text in another over against them, so that the eye catches, at a glance, the whole of the result. It would be out of place to insert this table here, but the reader will find it in pp. xli—xliv. of Mr. Norton's book ; and he will also find, upon close examination, that there is scarcely one among the whole of these readings which is worth a passing notice, excepting perhaps the $\delta\epsilon$ in Matt. 3: 1, and the omission of the doxology in 6: 13.

The triumphant result, then, of modern criticism with its im-

measurable and almost incredible labour, is, not the change of our text in any important respect, but *the settling of the great question, whether it needs to be changed*, IN THE NEGATIVE; and in the negative on an immoveable basis. I do not mean, of course, to assert this of every particle of the *Textus Receptus*, but to apply it to every thing which it contains that is of any serious importance. Who, that is of an investigating temperament, will not thank God and take courage from such a result as this, after so 'fiery a trial!'

The next section of Note A. is employed in an effort to shew that Matthew's Gospel was originally written in *Hebrew*; although Mr. Norton admits that it must have been very early translated. The next following section assigns reasons why he considers Matt. i. ii. to be *supposititious*; also Matt. 27: 3—10, and likewise vs. 52, 53. To these he adds Mark 16: 9—20. Luke 22: 43, 44. John 5: 3, 4. 8: 3—11. 22: 24, 25.

By far the most important of all these supposed interpolations is the first, viz. Matt. i. ii. The importance attached to the position which Mr. Norton has taken in regard to them, renders it proper that the subject should be discussed at length. A book so grave and weighty as his, and withal so candid for the most part and serious too, if it contain important error, should not be left without at least an attempt to point out that error. My belief is, that Mr. Norton errs in the position he has taken as to the *original* language of Matthew's Gospel, and also as to the spuriousness of its two first chapters. As he has connected these two subjects together in his views and reasonings, it seems to be necessary to examine both of his positions; which in due time I would hope to do.

As to the other passages the genuineness of which he calls in question, I shall be able to bestow on them only a passing notice, lest the readers of this work should be wearied with discussions of this nature. Still, I must enter my protest, at least, against some of his conclusions, and give some brief reasons for so doing.

In Note B. Mr. Norton has presented us with the various readings of Gospels compared by Origen, which readings that father recorded. The reader is referred to them, as affording complete evidence that the text of his day was even more uniform than it now is; and also as an exposition of *facts* in respect to discrepancies among ancient Mss., by which we are to explain the declarations of Origen, Jerome, and others, about this

interesting subject, which have so often been quoted and misconstrued by the looser critics. He will find evidence in this catalogue, also, of the same discrepancies among Mss. then as now ; which shews with what fidelity the Gospels have been transmitted through so great a period of time.

Note C. gives us three well-known and acknowledged interpolations of the Gospels, to which I have had occasion before to advert, p. 284. The reader will find them fully exhibited in this Note, and some very sensible remarks from Mr. Norton accompanying them.

Note D. introduces again the subject of the *Correspondencies of the first three Gospels*, and discusses at length and in a masterly manner all the essential parts of this subject. Seldom indeed have I experienced greater pleasure in reading any discussion, than in following the clue which Mr. Norton has proffered to conduct us through this labyrinth, not less perplexing than that of the Minotaur in Crete. After wearying oneself for years to put together some kind of garment made out of such complex and *arachnaean* filaments as the web contains that has been woven by Eichhorn, Marsh, Gratz, and others, it is truly comforting to light upon a piece of plain substantial cloth of firm texture and well adapted for hard service. To speak more literally ; Mr. Norton has made the subject plain and intelligible ; and to do this, he must have expended more labour on his Note, than on any other part of his book ; unless, indeed, he has more of the renowned second-sight than most others, which would enable him to spy out some shorter way than usual, in traversing the *longae ambages* of the theory in question.

My limits forbid me to follow Mr. Norton through all the stages of his admirable discussion. I will only state enough to enable the readers of this Miscellany to understand the nature of the question, and the general run of the discussion.

Mr. Norton states at the outset, in brief but comprehensive terms, the nature of the subject.

The remarkable agreement among the first three Gospels, has given occasion to many attempts to explain its origin. But, generally, in the hypotheses that have been framed, it has not been sufficiently kept in mind, that its occurrence with so much that is *dissimilar*, is one of the principal phenomena to be accounted for ; and that, though our ultimate purpose be to solve the problem of the correspondences among those Gospels, it must embrace likewise a solution of their differences. Together with this, the appearances to be explained are as follows.

Many portions of the history of Jesus are found in common in the first three Gospels ; others are common to two of their number, but not found in the third. In the passages referred to, there is generally a similarity, sometimes a very great similarity, in the selection of particular circumstances, in the aspect under which the event is viewed, and the style in which it is related. Sometimes, the language found in different Gospels, though not identical, is equivalent, or nearly equivalent ; and not unfrequently, the same series of words, with or without slight variations, occurs throughout the whole, or a great part of a sentence, and even in larger portions ; pp. c. seq.

A very important statement of facts follows closely in the sequel to this passage. Mr. Norton designs by it to lay before his readers the general nature of the *coincidences* between the three first Gospels, and also to inform them in how great a proportion of each Gospel these coincidences may be found. As the passage is fundamental in the whole discussion, I must produce it.

By far the larger portion of this verbal agreement is found in the recital of the words of others, and particularly of the words of Jesus. Thus, in Matthew's Gospel, the passages verbally coincident with one or both of the other two Gospels, amount to less than a sixth part of its contents ; and of this, about seven eighths occur in the recital of the words of others, and only one eighth in what, by way of distinction, I may call mere narrative, in which the evangelist, speaking in his own person, was unrestrained in the choice of his expressions. In Mark, the proportion of coincident passages to the whole contents of the Gospel is about one sixth, of which not one fifth occurs in the narrative. Luke has still less agreement of expression with the other evangelists. The passages in which it is found amount only to about a tenth part of his Gospel ; and but an inconsiderable portion of it appears in the narrative ; in which there are very few instances of its existence for more than half a dozen words together. It may be computed as less than a twentieth part.

These definite proportions are important, as showing distinctly in how small a part of each Gospel there is any verbal coincidence with either of the other two ; and to how great a degree such coincidence is confined to passages in which the evangelists professedly give the words of others, particularly of Jesus ; pp. ci. seq.

Having given these extracts, it becomes a matter of importance to give another which affords a kind of *coup d'oeil* of Mr. Norton's general grounds and course of thought, throughout his whole note on the subject before us.

As a preliminary, then, toward accounting for the agreement of language in the first three Gospels, we must divide each of them

into two portions ; the one consisting of that part in which the evangelist speaks in his own person, and the other of words professedly not his own. Having done this, it appears from the statements before made, that the same cause could not have operated alone in both these different portions, to produce coincidence of language. We cannot explain this phenomenon by the supposition, that the Gospels were transcribed either one from another, or all from common documents ; because, if such transcription had been the cause, it would not have produced results so unequal in the different portions into which the Gospels naturally divide themselves.

But in regard to the words of Jesus, other causes were in operation, that may account for the verbal coincidences among the evangelists, in their reports of what he said. There was, in this case, an invariable archetype, to which each writer would endeavour to conform himself. Events may be correctly related in many forms of language different from each other. Words can be repeated with accuracy only in one form. But each of the first three evangelists intended to give the words of his master as they were uttered by him. Nor is it to be supposed, that the evangelist, while writing, merely recollected those words as having been formerly uttered by Jesus, and repeated them for the first time. He had often, without doubt, quoted them in his oral discourses, and heard them quoted by his fellow-preachers of Christianity. From the nature of the case, they must, many of them, have become formularies in which the doctrines and precepts of our religion were expressed. The agreement of the first three evangelists, in their reports of the words of Christ, is no greater than these considerations would lead us to anticipate. There is no ground for any other hypothesis concerning it ; pp. cii. seq.

In addition to these natural sources of agreement or sameness, it should be mentioned, that the words of others which are cited, as well as those of the Saviour ; and in like manner all the quotations from the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament ; would of course fall under the same general category. The cases where the quotations of the Evangelists differ from the Septuagint text, and yet agree with each other, Mr. Norton very naturally solves by the supposition, (which we know must in many cases have been matter of fact), that the Septuagint text of the Evangelists' day differed in many places from that in our present copies.

Mr. Norton observes, in the next place, that the coincidences of the Gospels as to *diction*, " does not lie together in masses." They are almost every where confined to clauses merely, or fragments of sentences ; rarely do they make up, without in-

terruption, even a single verse at a time. In order to exemplify this, he presents, in the way of comparison, the account given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, of the cure of the paralytic at Capernaum; which is a fair specimen of what is common to many paragraphs of the first three Gospels. The minute discrepancies which every where appear, even in such accounts as this, shew something different in each case from the hand of a mere copyist or redactor.

The discrepancies in chronology, or, to speak more accurately, *the discrepancies as to series or order of events*, in the different Gospels, have from the most ancient times attracted the notice of all critical readers. It is well known that Mark and Luke depart from the order of Matthew in a number of somewhat important cases; moreover, that although they agree more nearly with each other than they do with Matthew, in regard to the general order of events, yet in several cases even Mark and Luke are quite discrepant from each other.

These differences Mr. Norton has brought fully into view; and he insists that these, as well as the other phenomena of the Gospels, ought to be accounted for by the theories that have lately been proffered to the notice of the public, before we can adopt those theories as probable.

He then proceeds to examine the supposition, that two of the Evangelists copied, the one from his predecessor, and the other from both his predecessors. For example; we may suppose that Luke first copied from Matthew, and then Mark copied from both Matthew and Luke. Now the points of disagreement between Matthew and Luke are so many, both as to matter, manner, order, and idiom, that any thing like *copying* on the part of Luke, in the common sense of that word, is quite out of question. Then in the next place, Mark differs so widely from both the others, in regard to compass and kinds of matter, manner, order, etc., that no tolerable probability can be made out of his having been a *copyist*; nor, indeed, in case he had been, can we assign any credible motive for undertaking his performance.

By considerations such as these, and allied to these, Mr. Norton tries and examines the various theories which maintain that the Evangelists were copyists of each other; some copyists in this way, and some in that, for there is no one of the three Evangelists in question, who has not been placed first in order by some of the critics. To all such as have been per-

plexed by the theories on the subject of the formation of the Gospels, which critics have lately excogitated ; to all who wish to see how easy it is to impose upon one's self, and on the public too, by publishing one-sided and partial views of any matter ; I would most sincerely commend the diligent perusal of what Mr. Norton has written on this subject. The conviction which I have long had, that the whole affair is only "castle-building in the air," has been greatly heightened by reading Mr. Norton.

But while the theory, which maintained that one Evangelist copied from another or others, has of late been gradually and almost silently going into desuetude on account of the internal and insuperable difficulties which it presents, the newer and more fashionable one of a *Protevangelium*, which Eichhorn and Marsh have decked out in so many gaudy colours, has been wide spread on the continent, as I have before remarked. Eichhorn was not indeed the father, but only the nurse, of this unlucky progeny. Semler I take to be its progenitor ; Lessing, Niemeyer, Halfeld, and Paulus, its *Lucinas* ; Eichhorn its prime-nurse, Marsh its god-father, and Ziegler, Gratz, Bertholdt, Weber, and Kuinoel, its foster-fathers.

But with all the nursing and care bestowed upon it, it has proved to be but a sickly child. It was born with the seeds of phthisis in its constitution ; and although for a while its ruddy face appeared to indicate, in early youth, some symptoms of a vigorous state, yet it soon began to grow pale and sickly. It has recently been fast approaching the last stages of disease ; and now Mr. Norton has administered a dose which will precipitate its death. If not, then my prognosis is not *secundum artem*.

I will not repeat here the account which is briefly given on p. 289 seq. above. Mr. Norton will present the reader with a more full and minute detail respecting the documents supposed to be employed by the Evangelists, on pp. cxxxiii. seq. of Addenda. The recapitulation of this, by Mr. Norton himself, may however be presented to help the reader on this occasion to a right view of the subject.

I will briefly recapitulate the steps in this hypothesis. The first supposition is of an Original Gospel, written in Hebrew, and receiving continual additions from various hands. This is supposed to have been used in three different forms by the first three evangelists, being in one of its forms, the basis of the work of each. Be-

sides this document, it is supposed, that there was another, a miscellaneous collection of discourses and sayings of Jesus, likewise written in Hebrew, which was used only by Matthew and Luke. Thus, *the genuine correspondence of matter and language*, among all three evangelists, and between any two of the evangelists in portions peculiar to them, is thought to be accounted for. The *verbal coincidences* between Mark and Luke are explained by the supposition, that they both used a Greek translation of the Original Gospel, made before that work had received any additions; and the verbal coincidences between our present Greek Gospel of Matthew and the other two Gospels, by the supposition, that his translator used their Gospels in rendering into Greek the Hebrew original of Matthew; p. cxxxvi.

On the supposed Protevangelium or Original Gospel thus proffered to the notice of the critical world, Mr. Norton proceeds to make some judicious and common-sense remarks. Very plain and striking is it, as he shews, that if such an Original Gospel did exist in early ages, it must have been regarded as a work of great importance and of very high credit. Otherwise, how is it rational to suppose, that the Evangelists all chose it as the basis of their respective works?

Copies, moreover, of such a work must have been widely circulated, and have of course been in the hands of many Christians in different regions and countries. How then comes it about, that *no ancient writer ever once makes mention of any such Protevangelium*? THE FACT CANNOT BE DISPUTED. There is not a solitary hint of any such thing in all Christian antiquity. Yet we have often repeated mention of any and all kinds of apocryphal writings, even the most contemptible and insignificant. But the book of books—the great legitimate source of our canonical Gospels—the spring from which all these streams issued—is not even once named among such writers as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, or any of their followers!

The whole affair, then, is upon the very face of it an incredible thing. And still more difficult than even the matter above, is the fact that no copy of such an authentic and important work as the Protevangelium, has ever been preserved. Origen, the great investigator of all ancient Mss., never, in all his travels, lighted upon such a treasure as this.

Facts such as these give a death-blow to all the claims which can be urged, in favour of such a work. Mr. Norton has not failed to urge these, and to set the whole matter in its proper light.

Other considerations, and weighty and conclusive ones too, Mr. Norton urges against the claims that have been made in favour of a Protevangelium. It could not have been tampered with, considering its weight and authenticity, in such a manner as Eichhorn and Marsh suppose. Such a process was contrary to all preconceived notions and ordinary habits of the Jews, in respect to writings deemed sacred. Matthew, in particular, having been an original eye-witness of the public life of Jesus, did not need any such additions as were made to the Protevangelium, nor indeed the work itself, to give him information. Luke and Mark had a more certain source to which they could appeal, than an interpolated document which had gone through alterations by all sorts of hands. Luke's own testimony, in the Preface to his Gospel, is directly in the face of such a supposition ; for there he states, not his dependence on *written* documents, but the contrary. Nothing like the embodying of an Original Gospel in their productions, can be found in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke ; nor do these Gospels enable any one at all, as Eichhorn affirms they do, to separate what was originally selected and what was adjectitious. The variations—unimportant variations—of the Evangelists from each other, in cases where the matter and expression in various respects correspond, cannot be accounted for on any rational ground, if we suppose them to have copied an Original Gospel. Such variations exhibit no appearance of being designed *emendations* ; and if they are not so, how came they to be made ? Moreover, the appropriate uniformity of style in each of the different Gospels shews that they are not compiled from a work, which had already been altered some five or six times (as Eichhorn and Marsh would lead us to suppose) before it came into their hands.

I hope Mr. Norton will be ready, when we come to the examination of his theory about the spuriousness of Matt. i. ii. and his belief in a Hebrew original of Matthew, to recognize what he has here so well and truly said, of the individual and consistent character, "the well defined features," of Matthew's Gospel. I fully accord with what is here said ; and have only to ask that neither he nor my readers may suffer it to pass from their recollection.

Although I have made out a short summary, and a very brief one it is, of Mr. Norton's arguments against the supposition of a Protevangelium, yet, that the reader may be led still

better to comprehend this subject, I will present him with a recapitulation made by Mr. Norton himself, near the close of his arguments.

Notwithstanding, therefore, the ingenuity and labor with which the hypothesis in question has been defended, I believe the objections to which it is exposed, occur, in a more or less definite form, to almost every one who has examined it. It supposes an Original Gospel, sanctioned by the apostles; yet, had such a work existed, we cannot believe, that, even if the Hebrew original had perished, its Greek translation would have been lost, and no memory of the book remain. It supposes this book to have been treated in a manner without parallel in literary history, and wholly inconsistent with the authority which must have been ascribed to it. It implies a solicitude about the finishing and refashioning of writings, equally inconsistent with the character and habits of the Jews of Palestine. It requires us to believe, that the evangelists copied into their histories the collections of anonymous individuals; when one of them was an eyewitness of the events which he related, and the other two were in habits of continual intercourse with those, who, like him, were the primary sources of information respecting the history of Jesus, and the business of whose lives it was to afford this information to others. It is inconsistent with the account which St. Luke gives of the manner in which he procured the materials for his Gospel, and with the historical notices which we have of the composition of the other Gospels of Matthew and Mark, notices, which, so far as they represent these Gospels as containing what the apostles had before delivered orally, are confirmed by their intrinsic probability. And it fails of its proposed object. It does not explain the phenomena of the agreement and disagreement of the first three Gospels; but, on the other hand, is irreconcilable with the appearances those Gospels present. For it supposes, that an original document was so used as the basis of the first three Gospels, that it is still preserved in each; while, in fact, no such document can be discovered. On the contrary, in the unsuccessful attempts made to restore this document, it becomes necessary to represent it as so brief, defective, and unsatisfactory, that we cannot believe such a work to have existed, because we can discern no purpose for which it could have been intended. The hypothesis implies, that the correspondences of the three Gospels may be separated from their differences by a sort of mechanical process, so that the former may afterward be brought together and form a connected whole; while, in fact, the one and the other are blended so intimately, as continually to appear together in the same narrative. In attempting to account for the correspondences of these books with each other, it presents a solution which requires much more correspondence than exists. And, in the last place, the

number of writers whom it represents as contributing materials for the Gospels, is irreconcilable with the individuality of character evident in each of them ; pp. clix. seq.

Mr. Norton next proceeds to shew, that there is another and more satisfactory method of accounting for the coincidences of the three first Gospels. In substance this is given on p. 289 seq. above. The amount of it is, that the events of Jesus's life and his sayings were so deeply impressed on the minds of multitudes, that they needed no writings at first, in order to recal them to memory. But when a new generation came to spring up, who had not witnessed these things, the danger of forgetting them, and of varying the narrations respecting them, became more and more apparent. There were, however, many original witnesses still living, when the Gospels were written. The preachers of the Gospel had often, and in each other's presence, given accounts of many important facts and sayings of Jesus. On all sides, the *essential* features in narrations of this sort were preserved, and were apparent ; while some individuality would also of course appear, in the different modes of expression adopted by different narrators.

A single passage from Mr. Norton here, will illustrate and expand this view.

We conclude, then, that portions of the history of Jesus, longer or shorter, were often related by the apostles ; and it is evident, that the narrative at each repetition by the same individual, would become more fixed in its form, so as soon to be repeated by him with the same circumstances and the same turns of expression. Especially, would no one vary from himself in reporting the words of his Master. We have next to consider, that the apostles, generally, would adopt a uniform mode of relating the same events. The twelve apostles, who were companions of our Saviour, resided together at Jerusalem, we know not for how long a period, certainly for several years ; acting and preaching in concert. This being the case, they would confer together continually ; they would be present at each other's discourses, in which the events of their Master's life were related ; they would, in common, give instruction respecting his history and doctrine to new converts, especially to those who were to go forth as missionaries. From all these circumstances, their modes of narrating the same events would become assimilated to each other. Particularly would their language be the same, or nearly the same, in quoting and applying passages of the Old Testament as prophetic ; and in reciting the words of Jesus, whose very expressions they must have been desirous of retaining. But the verbal agree-

ment between the first three Gospels is found, as we have seen, principally where the evangelists record words spoken by Christ or by others, or allege passages from the Old Testament. Elsewhere there is often much resemblance of conception and expression, but, comparatively, much less verbal coincidence ; pp. clxvi. seq.

Mr. Norton, in mentioning that the instruction of the Rabbies was given *orally* and *retained by memory*, and thus showing that the Jews were accustomed to the exercise of their memories in the way of preserving what their teachers inculcated, has not urged the subject, as it seems to me, so far as he might and should have done. He does not mention that the whole copy of the *oral law* of the Jews, which they call *Mishna* (i. e. the iteration) was brought down *memoriter* to the time of the Rabbi Joseph Hakkodesh, i. e. to more than a century after the birth of Christ. There cannot be a question that many of the rites and maxims of the Pharisees, adverted to in the Gospels, are embodied in the Mishna. The book itself begins with the declaration, that the contents of it were delivered orally to Moses on Mount Sinai ; then by him to the Seventy Elders ; by these to heads of divisions and families ; by them to the mass of the people ; and so in succession down to the time when Rabbi Judah committed the whole to writing. I do not cite this story because I believe in it ; but I cite it to shew, that the Mishna must have been quite an ancient tradition, in order to render it possible for a writer to palm off such a story upon the Jewish nation ; and that, at all events, the extraordinary retention in a mere *memoriter* way of the whole of the Mishna for a long time, shews to what extent such matters were carried among the Jews.

All the *Eastern* world exhibits the like phenomena. Let the reader call to mind the *rhapsodists* in hither Asia who so long preserved Homer, while they sung him ; or the innumerable story-tellers of the East, who will entertain their employers, by reciting *memoriter* many more narrations than the *Thousand and One* contains. Among all nations, in earlier ages, such practices existed to a wide extent, where there was any cultivation of mind.

There is nothing strange then in the fact, that those who sat daily at the feet of Jesus for more than three years, should have remembered to a wide extent his sayings and doings ; nothing strange in the fact, that when they reduced the account of these things to writing, there should have been so many striking coin-

cidences between different writings. Yet, with all these coincidences, it is perfectly natural to suppose, that there must have been peculiarities appropriate to each individual Evangelist, as to his mode of viewing each subject, his method of stating it, and the extent of what was comprised in his account. Such is the fact beyond all doubt. On the ground that *inspiration* is fully credited in each case, this would make no important difference in respect to diversities. The Greek and Roman writers do not exhibit more striking discrepancies of style and modes of representation, than those which are apparent in both the Old Testament and the New.

Mr. Norton endeavours, on p. cclxx. seq., to account for the occasional *verbal* agreement between Mark and Luke, by the supposition that the Gospel was more usually preached in the Greek language, particularly at Jerusalem, where was always a concourse of foreign Jews, who spoke that language and probably would not have well understood the Hebrew. The words of the Saviour being often stated in the Greek language, would be remembered by those who often heard them, and repeated in like manner, in many respects, by those from whom Mark and Luke obtained information.

But here a difficulty occurs in regard to the occasional *sameness* of Matthew's Gospel also. Mr. Norton, as we have seen, supposes this to have been originally written in *Hebrew*. The translator of this Hebrew to Greek, then, as he here maintains, when he came to passages parallel in sentiment with some passages in Mark and Luke, instead of making a simple and direct version of his original, expressed the sentiment of it in the language of one or both of the two latter Evangelists. Of course, he supposes the translator to have had the Gospels of Mark and Luke before him.

There is another point in respect to this similarity, which must be exhibited in Mr. Norton's own language, in order to do justice to him.

But there is, further, a remarkable phenomenon in the verbal coincidences between the Greek Gospel of Matthew and the Gospels of Mark and Luke, which shows that the translator of Matthew used those Gospels in a particular manner. Throughout the matter *common to all three Gospels*, his rendering is, with very trifling exceptions, never coincident with the words of Luke, except in passages where there was a previous verbal coincidence between Luke and Mark ; while in the matter common only to Matthew and Luke, he

often adopts the words of the latter. The obvious solution of this fact is, that the translator, in his renderings, did not rely merely upon his general recollection of the phraseology of Mark and Luke, but wrote with their Gospels open before him; and that, finding the correspondence between the language of his original and that of Mark much greater than between it and that of Luke, he used the Gospel of Mark alone so far as it contained the same matter, and had recourse to that of Luke only when Mark failed him. Thus, in the matter common to all three, he agrees with Luke only accidentally, that is, where there was a previous agreement between Luke and Mark; pp. clxxii. seq.

In the next paragraph he states, that on the supposition that Matthew wrote originally in *Hebrew*, the verbal agreement of his Greek Gospel can be accounted for in no other way than this. A more important conclusion still he deduces from the alleged coincidence of agreement with Luke as stated above, where the latter agrees with Mark in cases of matter common to both—the conclusion namely, that Matthew's Gospel must have been originally written in Hebrew, because such a phenomenon in respect to coincidence can be accounted for in no other way, than by supposing it to have been occasioned by the manner in which the translator performed his work. Where Mark and Luke exhibit the same matter, the translator of Matthew, it is assumed, followed Mark; and the coincidence of Luke in such a case is accidental, or (in other words) springs merely from his having accorded with Mark in his expressions. Of course, then, where Luke differs from Mark, there the translator of Matthew follows the latter, and consequently disagrees with Luke; but where Luke and Matthew alone exhibit narrations of any particular thing, there the translator of Matthew resorted to Luke as his model, and there the resemblance between them is striking.

Mr. Norton thinks that this discovery of the manner in which Matthew harmonizes with Mark, in the way of preference to Luke, and then with Luke where Mark fails him, is "one of the most important of all the explanations that have been given of the phenomena of the correspondencies among the Gospels." He deems it due, therefore, to Bishop Marsh, to acknowledge him as the author of this discovery, lest he should be thought to arrogate to himself the credit arising from so important a discovery, which is due to the Bishop.

It seems not a little strange however to me, that Mr. Norton,

who has been so keen-sighted in spying out the faults and errors of the wonderful conceit about an *Original Gospel*, as the grand menstruum by which all difficulties were to be solved, should have given so easy credence to the Bishop of Peterborough in the present case. I can explain it only by the supposition, that he saw in this theory, as he says, a conclusive reason in favour of an original Hebrew Gospel, and then found decisive evidences of the work of a translator and of the manner of that work.

I should begin the examination of this theory, in case I felt at liberty now to go fully into it, by a denial of the main fact, viz., that in cases where all three of the Evangelists relate the same occurrence and Luke differs from Matthew, Matthew, i. e. the translator of Matthew, attaches himself to Mark and agrees with him. Nothing is like *facts* in such a case; but to them I must briefly refer the reader, not thinking it meet here to produce the Greek originals at full length. I refer him, however, to the pages in Newcome's Greek Harmony, the second edition recently published, where these originals are spread out to his eye, and he can instantly determine whether my statement is correct.

Compare then, (1) Matt. 17: 18 with the latter part of Luke 9: 42 and Mark 9: 25. (Harm. p. 105.)

Here Matthew, although discrepant in some respects from both of the other Evangelists, is plainly much nearer in matter and manner to Luke than he is to Mark.

(2) Matt. 17: 22 with Mark 9: 31 and Luke 9: 44. (Harm. p. 106.)

Here Luke and Matthew exhibit *μῆλλει παραδίδοσθαι*, while Mark has simply *παραδίδοται*.

(3) Matt. 22: 27 with Mark 12: 22 and Luke 20: 32. (Harm. p. 156.)

In this case Matthew and Luke exhibit *ὑστερον δὲ πάντων*, while Mark has *ἔσχατη πάντων*.

(4) Matt. 26: 16 with Mark 14: 11 and Luke 22: 6. (Harm. p. 172.)

Here Matthew and Luke have *ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν*; while Mark says: *ἐζήτει πῶς εὐκαιρῶς*.

(5) Matt. 27: 59 with Mark 15: 46 and Luke 23: 53. (Harm. p. 207.)

Here Matthew and Luke: *ἐνειύλιξεν αὐτὸ (sc. σῶμα Ἰησοῦ) σινδόνι*; while Mark says: *ἐνείλησε τῇ σινδόνι*.

(6) Matt. 28: 6 with Mark 16: 6 and Luke 24: 6. (Harm. p. 210.)

Here Matthew and Luke say : *Οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἠγέρθη γάρ,* (Luke, *ἀλλ' ἠγέρθη*) ; while Mark says : *ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε.*

These examples of discrepancy I have taken from De Wette's Introduction to the New Testament, § 80, Note *a*. With this meagre list he seems to rest satisfied, in opposing the view of Bishop Marsh, which is presented above and which is so much applauded by Mr. Norton. My first impression on examining this list was, that it must be a rare case indeed in which Matthew could be found to agree with the diction of Luke, while the example of Mark was also before him. So at least De Wette would seem to have thought, when he gave to his readers such a list of coincidences with Matthew, seemingly the result of comparison throughout the parallel passages of the three first Gospels. The list is introduced into the midst of statements that wear an imposing appearance of great labour and diligence, in the examination of all the coincidences and discrepancies of the Gospels.

But I had learned, many years since, to believe that De Wette, with all his talent and learning (and he has much of both), is a very hasty, and not unfrequently a very inaccurate writer, and is not always to be depended on where long continued and patient research must be made. It was a matter of course, therefore, for me to resort to the Greek Harmony, and there, to my surprise, after reading such statements in Bishop Marsh, Mr. Norton, and De Wette, I found, without any pains-taking, in every section which I investigated merely as it occurred on opening the book, facts which shew how utterly groundless this great discovery of my Lord of Peterborough is. Will the reader have patience while I present him with a few examples of what a few hours' diligent research brought under my notice ? The point to be settled here, (and this is my apology for dwelling upon it), is of more importance than every one at first view will be ready to suppose.

In the very first instance of triplex harmony that occurs in the Gospels, there are some striking discrepancies in the mode of narration, in which Matthew *follows*, (if I may be allowed this word merely for brevity's sake, for I hold Matthew to have been entirely an original writer), Luke instead of Mark.

(*a*) Compare Matt. 3: 3 with Mark 1: 2, 3 and Luke 3: 4. (Harm. p. 12.)

Here, after the words *Isaiah the prophet*, common to all three of the Evangelists, Matthew and Luke use *λέγοντος*, and

then quote a passage from the Old Testament, as it stands in the Septuagint (Is. 40: 3), with the exception that instead of τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν there at the close, the two Evangelists both read αὐτοῦ. But here Mark, after the words *Isaiah the prophet*, inserts a passage from Malachi 3: 1, and then proceeds with the quotation from Isaiah, as in the other Evangelists. Moreover he omits the word λέγοντος, and in its stead employs γέγραπται.

(b) Matt. 3: 11, compare with Mark 1: 7, 8 and Luke 3: 16. (Harm. p. 13.)

Here Matthew and Luke employ βαπτίζω; but Mark has ἐβάπτισε. Matthew and Luke say, αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ; but Mark says, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, differing in some respects as to manner, order, and matter.

(c) Matt. 9: 5 with Mark 2: 9 and Luke 5: 23. (Harm. p. 32.)

Here, after τί . . . εὐκοπώτερον; εἰπεῖν. Matthew and Luke immediately subjoin: ἀφένονται σου (σοι) αἱ ἁμαρτίαι; ἢ εἰπεῖν. Ἐγείραι καὶ περιπάτει; but Mark inserts τῷ παραλυτικῷ after the first εἰπεῖν, and for the last phrase he has Ἐγείρε, ἄρῳν σου τὸν κράββατον, καὶ περιπάτει;

(d) Matt. 12: 1 with Mark 2: 23 and Luke 6: 1. (Harm. p. 36.)

Matthew says, οἱ μαθηταὶ . . . ἤρξαντο τίλλειν στάχνας καὶ ἐσθίειν; Luke, ἔτιλλον . . . τοὺς στάχνας, καὶ ἤσθιον; while Mark says, ἤρξαντο οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχνας, wholly omitting ἤσθιον.

And again in the next succeeding verses, Matthew and Luke, ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ (ἐν τοῖς σάββασι), while Mark has τί ποιοῦσιν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι.

(e) Matt. 12: 4 with Mark 2: 26 and Luke 6: 4. (Harm. p. 37.)

Here Matthew and Luke, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν (ἔλαβε); but Mark inserts after θεοῦ the words ἐνὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως.

(f) Matt. 12: 13 with Mark 3: 5 and Luke 6: 10. (Harm. p. 38.)

Rejecting the evidently spurious readings here, Matthew says, καὶ ἀποκατεστράθη ὑγιὲς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη, but Luke adds ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ after ἀποκατεστράθη and omits ὑγιὲς (according to the

corrected text) ; while Mark simply says, ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ, omitting wholly the ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

(g) Matt. 12: 25 with Mark 3: 24 and Luke 11: 17. (Harm. p. 53.)

Matthew and Luke, πᾶσα βασιλεία [δια] μερισθεῖσα . . . ἐρημοῦται; but Mark, ἐὰν βασιλεία . . . μερισθῇ, οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι.

(h) Matt. 13: 8 with Mark 4: 7 and Luke 8: 7. (Harm. p. 62.)

Matthew and Luke, ἀπέπνιξαν; Mark, συνέπνιξαν.

(i) Matt. 13: 10 with Mark 4: 10 and Luke 8: 9. (Harm. p. 62.)

Matthew and Luke, οἱ μαθηταί; Mark, οἱ περὶ αὐτόν.

(j) Matt. 19: 21 with Mark 10: 21 and Luke 18: 22. (Harm. p. 137.)

Here Matthew and Luke, ἀκολούθει μοι κ. τ. λ.; while Mark adds to this, ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν, and then proceeds like the others.

(k) Matt. 21: 23 with Mark 11: 28 and Luke 20: 2. (Harm. p. 150.)

Matthew and Luke, τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην κ. τ. λ.; Mark adds ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς, and then proceeds as the others. In the next verses Matthew and Luke have ἐρωτήσω, and Mark ἐπερωτήσω.

(l) Matt. 24: 7 with Mark 13: 8 and Luke 21: 11. (Harm. p. 163.)

Matthew and Luke, ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί; Mark, λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί.

(m) Matt. 24: 29 with Mark 13: 25 and Luke 21: 26. (Harm. p. 165.)

Matthew and Luke, αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται; Mark, αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται.

But I withhold my hand. I have a number of other examples marked, the fruit of a few hours search, and of a like tenor with those produced above.

It is in vain for Mr. Norton to allege, in reply to these instances, that they are of little consequence as to the *sense*. I admit this most fully; and I must admit it, and so must he, in other innumerable cases of discrepancy as to diction between the different Evangelists. But the simple question is, whether, in case of coincidence as to matter between the first three Gospels, Matthew has *always* conformed to the diction of Mark in

preference to that of Luke, where conformity to either, on his part, is at all exhibited. The result of the above examination is, that there is no correctness in the allegation that he has.

I will not say that Matthew in the case supposed, does not oftener agree with Mark than Luke, where the two latter differ from each other; but my examination has led me in some good measure to distrust even so much as this. It happened, I presume, to Bishop Marsh and Mr. Norton, that in their comparisons, pursued perhaps to quite a moderate extent, Matthew appeared to agree mostly, (Bishop Marsh says *entirely*), with Mark. But it is impossible to pursue this investigation to any great length, and yet retain the belief that such is the exclusive, or (I would even venture to say) the habitual fact. I have opened my Greek Harmony at random throughout; and not one page have I any where examined, without finding facts to contradict the theory of Bishop Marsh and Mr. Norton. It is impossible for me to believe, therefore, that a more extensive examination still will not produce more overwhelming testimony against it.

One other sensation, or persuasion (if this be a better name), has been produced in a manner that I shall never forget; and this is a deep and thorough feeling, that the discrepancies of style and manner of expression in the Evangelists so immeasurably exceed the identities, that there is not the least probability that they copied each other, or copied any common documents. These diversities, indeed, are not such as can well be presented on paper. They can be learned only by being *seen* and *felt*. The reader must take up his Greek Harmony, and spend a few hours in making the most minute comparisons; and when he has done this, I think I can venture to say, that he never again will open his ears to any charge of *plagiarism*, or of mere labour like that of *copyists* or *redactors*, made against the Evangelists. In the parts where the resemblance between them is strongest of all, the diversity is still such as to leave not the least doubt on my mind of composition original and independent.

The conviction that such is the case springs from the nature of the diversities in question. No earthly motive can be assigned for them, in case either or all of the writers were plagiarists or copyists. They are not *corrections*, nor *emendations*, nor *addenda*; they concern neither the rhetoric nor the sense of the passages in which they stand. They are evidently the

simple differences in modes of expression which are personal and inbred, if not inborn; and differences like to these, are always found, at all times and in all ages, between the modes of expression in different individuals.

Were I not afraid of wearying out the reader, I would now proceed to show how little of correctness there is in the other part of Mr. Norton's theory and that of Bishop Marsh, in relation to the general subject before us, viz., that Matthew and Luke fall into striking coincidences, where they are the only two narrators.

Let the reader turn to p. 16 of the Greek Harmony, and compare the minute history of the temptation of the Saviour, in the two Evangelists. Let him notice not only the difference in style and manner of these narrations, but also the fact that even the *order* of two of the cases of temptation is reversed in one of these historians.

Let him next turn to the Sermon on the Mount (p. 40 seq.) and see what striking diversities there are in the narrations there. Then let him cast his eye on the history of the healing of the Centurion's servant, p. 47; where the diversity is so great, that even *contradiction* has been not unfrequently alleged against it. Go next to the conference between Jesus and some of John's disciples (p. 49), and, if we except the words of Jesus as repeated by both Evangelists, how little of exact coincidence shall we find! And thus might I proceed until I should point out every section of the Gospel history which is peculiar to these two writers. The whole amount, however, is but comparatively small.

I do not, therefore, and I cannot, after such an examination as I have made, admit at all the statements in question of Bishop Marsh and Mr. Norton. *Facts* do not support them. Of course I cannot admit that any of the deductions which Mr. Norton draws from them, are at all substantiated on this ground.

I have only one more remark to make on this already protracted topic. This is, that the very reasoning which Mr. Norton has employed with so much power and success in overthrowing the general theory of a *Protevangelium*, may be employed against his own view of what the Greek translator of Matthew must be supposed to have done. Nothing can be more certain to my mind, than that the characteristics of the present Gospel of Matthew do not admit of the idea, that a *translator* reduced this book to its present form, by partly adopt-

ing Mark, partly leaning upon Luke, and then again depending on himself. My own belief as to the style of the book, is, that it is such as not even to admit the supposition of its being a *version* at all. But of this more in its proper place.

As to some other allegations made by Bishop Marsh, and stated by Mr. Norton in a Note on p. clxxiv., viz., that the *proportional* coincidence is greater between Matthew and Luke, when they are the sole narrators, than exists elsewhere in case all three are the narrators; that in those portions of Matthew's Gospel which "occupy different places" from the corresponding ones in Mark, there is no verbal coincidence between them; and that in portions common only to Mark and Luke there are but two instances of verbal agreement between them; Mr. Norton himself doubts the first and last. I can only add here, that I do not think there is any good foundation for either of the three assertions; and if in any particular case the facts be as stated, they arise from a cause very different from that stated by the Bishop.

Mr. Norton next goes into an examination of the *questio verata* respecting the discrepancies in the *chronological* order of events as stated by the Evangelists. He speaks familiarly here, as I observe with regret, of *mistakes and misarrangements* of Luke and Mark, in some well known cases where they differ from Matthew in the respect just mentioned. The general principle for solving the difficulty in question Mr. Norton thinks to be, the fact that Luke and Mark only *heard oral accounts* of the words and deeds of Jesus, where like things were naturally often grouped together; while Matthew, being an eye and ear-witness of the whole, followed an arrangement that comports with the order in which every thing actually took place.

But how, I ask, comes it on this ground, that Matthew, more than any other Evangelist, should have *grouped* together discourses evidently delivered at different times? For example; the parables contained in chap. xiii. of his Gospel. According to many critics, the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. v—vii., is made up in the same way; and although I doubt this, yet I cannot but admit that in many cases Matthew has *grouped* events in a matter not usual in the other Gospels. The contrary of this must have happened, if Mr. Norton is right in his conjectures.

My own apprehension of this whole matter is indeed quite different, it would seem, from that of Mr. Norton. The first

question which presents itself to my mind, in the investigation of this subject, is, whether the Evangelists ever *intended* to give a narration of events in the life of Jesus, in such a manner (as to *arrangement*) as that in which biographical narrations are mostly conducted in modern times, i. e. following the *chronological* series of events? That they did *not* design this, I am fully persuaded, from the fact that it would have been easy to accomplish such a task at the time when the Gospels were written, inasmuch as many eye-witnesses, and apostles among these, were still living. But they were more occupied with the sayings and doings of Jesus, than with the exact order of them.

Why need this be accounted strange? There are four books extant, respecting the sayings and doings of the greatest moral philosopher that the heathen world has ever produced; and these were written too by a consummate master of rhetoric and history; yet these partake, in no degree, of a regular and chronological arrangement. I refer to the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon. Would it add any thing important to this peculiarly interesting book, if it were all digested according to the rules of chronology? I think every discerning reader will say: Nothing.

Such then was the fashion, if any please so to name it, of writing in ancient times, among men of the most cultivated minds and enlightened understanding. Should this offend us, when we meet with it among the Jewish writers?

There are, indeed, some circumstances in every case of this nature, which will not bear an arrangement that is not chronological. Such are the occurrences of birth and early life, and also of death. It could be only a perverted taste, which would intermingle these with an account of what was done and said in the midst of active life. But when the period of action is so short as that of Jesus—only about three and a half years—when this was a period of unintermitted preaching and benevolent action and miraculous cures; when an account of this is given simply for a *religious* and *moral* purpose; when nothing of the effect to be produced by the narration depends on exact chronological arrangement, but simply on the evidence and truth of facts themselves; and particularly when all these circumstances meet and combine in any particular case; why should we be stumbled by the fact, that a narration is not in keeping with our modern and occidental maxims of criticism with respect to writing biography.

That Matthew naturally followed the general tenor of events

as they occurred, may certainly be admitted ; or rather, it should be admitted, for it seems to be quite probable that he did. Having been present as an eye and ear-witness, nothing would be easier than for him to present the great outlines of facts as they originally succeeded each other. Yet even he, in some cases where he evidently *groups* things of a like kind, did not think it at all important to be bound in chronological chains. He has narrated in a free, and also in a natural, manner.

As to Luke and Mark, I suppose it will not be now contended that either of them were eye or ear-witnesses. Their condition, then, was evidently different from that of Matthew, to whom a clue had naturally been given by the circumstances in which he had been placed. They had heard a multitude of accounts respecting the life and actions of the Saviour, many more, no doubt, than those which they have recorded ; out of these they were to choose ; and unless chronological order had been before their minds as an important circumstance, one could not expect they would be solicitous to preserve it in respect to minute circumstances. Nothing depended on it, in regard to the objects which they laboured to accomplish. They differ, therefore, as we might naturally suppose, not only from Matthew in some respects, as to the order of events, but also from each other. (See Mr. Norton's Addenda, p. cxii. in the Note at the bottom.)

I would appeal now to the candour of every considerate reader, and ask him, whether, in such a case as that before us, where it would have been easy for each writer, had he deemed it to be of any importance to his design, to make such inquiries as would produce the same order in all—whether it does not lie upon the very face of the compositions before us, that particular and minute chronological order was not at all a matter of design ?

If this be conceded, then I would ask, whether the alleged *mistakes*, or *contradictions*, or *misarrangements*, of the writers in question, in regard to the point before us, can properly be spoken of as being plain and certain ? If a writer has placed events out of the actual order in which they occurred, and for purposes satisfactory to his own mind ; and if, at the same time, he made it no object to follow chronological order ; where is his *mistake* in this matter ? What seems now to be plain is, that the Evangelists had not the matter of chronology in their eye, in any other manner than the general one stated above ; and

that even Matthew himself, who has adhered more closely to it than the others, did so simply on the ground that his circumstances more naturally led him to do so, and not because it was a matter of special design on his part.

Mr. Norton has gone into a long disquisition in relation to some of the narrations of Luke, which he deems to be "misplaced," and to be deprived of more or less of their appropriate meaning by this circumstance. It would occupy too much room here to follow him through these remarks. While they shew that he has vigorously applied his mind to the subjects discussed, many of his exegetical remarks will not, so far as I am able to judge, give satisfaction to some of his exegetical readers. I must regard most of this discussion as unnecessary, because my views on the subject of chronological arrangement are so widely different, as it would seem, from those which he entertains.

Note E. is a long and able one, on the question, whether Justin Martyr has actually quoted our canonical Gospel? a subject already discussed at some length in the text of his book, but here more particularly and minutely examined. Mr. Norton gives us many specimens here of Justin's quotations, with a comparison of the Gospels from which he quotes; also of his quotations from the Septuagint; of his *repeated* quotations of the same passages in the Gospels; and of coincidences between him and the Greek text of Matthew, where Matthew deviates in his quotations from the Septuagint. To these the author has added remarks on the mode of quoting Scripture generally among the ancient Fathers of the church; and finally he has examined the new hypothesis of Credner, viz., that Justin used the *Gospel of Peter* as the source of his quotations. The objections which he makes to Credner's views are certainly of much weight; nor can I deem it possible, that Credner should render the main propositions comprised in his theory probable to the mind of any impartial critic well versed in the literature and criticism of the early ages of Christianity.

Mr. Norton will not complain that his book has been treated with neglect, and brought before the public as worth only a passing and hasty notice. He will rather complain, I fear, that I have almost interfered with his rights as an author, in extracting so largely from it. But I can assure the reader of this review, that Mr. Norton's book contains a great many passages which are excellent, that I have not thought proper to copy;

and there are very cogent reasons, therefore, why he should procure and read the whole book.

Mr. Norton will also perceive, that widely as I suppose myself to differ from him in regard to some points of theology, and perhaps even of criticism, but certainly of exegesis, yet I am not disposed in any measure to underrate his efforts on the common ground in which we are agreed. He has achieved a service which was very important in the present state of criticism and of skepticism.

As I have but a very moderate appetite for heresy-hunting, so I have not endeavoured to record every expression in Mr. Norton's book, which indicates a mode of thinking different from that which is generally called, and which I believe to be, orthodox. I fear that Mr. Norton rejects altogether the idea of *inspiration* in respect to the Gospels. I hope it is not so; but he sometimes speaks in such a way, that the belief of this is forced upon me. He tells us of things "erroneously referred by Mark;" that "Luke confounded the discourse;" that he "did not sufficiently discriminate" certain things; that he "misplaced" the words of John on a certain occasion; that he "misplaced" another discourse of the Saviour; that he "misapprehended" his meaning on another occasion; that Luke i. ii. has a "fabulous hue," and that "fiction and miracle are blended" there. On p. clxx. he gives an account, in a Note, of the manner in which Paul became informed of the truths of Christianity, in which he does not even advert to the fact repeatedly asserted by Paul, that the Saviour had appeared to him and had instructed him, and that on this very ground no apostle could claim a precedence over him. From a few things of this nature in the work before us, I am reluctantly obliged to believe, that the author does not admit the idea of *inspiration* in respect to the Gospels. He evidently views them as *credible* books, and worthy of all acceptation; with the exception of some few passages which he deems to be spurious, but which I shall not particularize, since they have already been noted in the preceeding pages.

It is a matter of sincere regret to me, that such passages as the above should be found in a work the tone and temper of which, at large, are truly worthy of imitation. The author seems to have set out with the full design not to give unnecessary offence to any class of his readers, and to present to the public a specimen of writing similar in its tone and manner to that of

Lardner. He should have full credit for this. And if now and then he has expressed himself without a recollection of this his general design, it would be foolish in the reader to reject the mass of good there is in the book, because of the few things of this kind which he may deem to be blemishes. I indulge the hope, that when this book comes to a second edition, (and if it meet its just deserts it certainly will), the author will sacrifice even the few remnants of his peculiar theology, which now and then gleam upon us, to the hope and prospect of the greater good which may be evidently achieved by his book in case they are omitted. To his own individual sentiments he of course must have a right, which none but his Maker can lawfully call in question. But it is not necessary that he should insist on the declaration of them in this valuable book, and especially it is unnecessary to declare them on a point, where, if he believes as I fear he does, the conviction that the Gospels are *genuine* would add little or nothing to the obligation which the world at large would feel, to admit them as their *Lex Suprema* in all cases of moral action.

I should decline the task, if it were in any way assigned to me, of undertaking to shew, that minds of a certain cast might or might not truly and sincerely believe in the Gospels, and receive them as the rule of faith and practice, although they rejected the idea that these Gospels were composed by writers under the influence of *divine inspiration*. I suppose it might be rendered probable to an enlightened mind, that the actual admission of the essential truths of the Gospel, as a rule of faith and practice, would belong to the *substance* of faith; a belief as to the manner in which the books had originated which presented these truths, would certainly be only a secondary ingredient in faith, when placed at its highest just estimation. Mr. Norton may say, perhaps, and it seems probable to me that he would say, that he admits the first, while he doubts about the last. But still, with all the respect that I cheerfully accord to the serious manner in which he presents and views the Gospels, I cannot help entertaining the most serious doubts, whether general skepticism, or rather practical infidelity, would not at last be the result of inculcating principles such as he holds, in regard to the authority, or rather I should say, perhaps, the origin of our sacred books. I do not take upon myself to determine, how minds like Mr. Norton's might decide respecting the *authority* of the Gospels, when they had been trained and

chastened in the school of moral philosophy and in all the discipline of a theological school ; but it is unnecessary to decide this, because the proportion of men in our community who are thus trained is so small. One thing, however, we may safely aver, viz., that any mere conviction of the genuineness of the gospels—any mere intellectual admission that they are correct and credible accounts of the life and doctrines of the Saviour—can and will never move the mass of men to yield to their *authority*. Does not Mr. Norton see, that this last point is so necessary, that all the rest being gained, nothing important is gained unless this follow as a sequent to the others ? But taking men as they are, with all that worldly spirit and all those desires of carnal indulgence which they possess and which they are for the most part heartily set upon gratifying, is there (humanly speaking) any chance to make real practical converts to Christianity, when the Scriptures are divested of *divine* authority, and made to extend no further than fallible human authority can go ? The hope of converting a sinful world on such grounds, does appear to me absolutely desperate. Without undertaking positively to decide, what a few minds trained like that of Mr. Norton might possibly admit, and how they might be influenced, can I hesitate to believe, that when the *divine* authority of the Gospels is given up, all is given up which gives them (if I may so speak) any chance of success in a world like this ?

Mr. Norton needs not to be informed, that *theoretical* believers are not such as the apostle James thinks ought to be ranked among Christians, whose faith is well-anchored. Important as his own book is, therefore, (and he must see that I deem it to be a performance of great merit in many respects, and deserving of very general attention), yet the community might go where his performance would carry them, and not be any thing more than *theoretical* believers. What is the next and the ultimate appeal then ? Mr. Norton does not even pretend to be an *authority*. And if his readers should lay down his book, with a conviction that his positions are well sustained, and still be inclined to ask, as many of them doubtless will ask : Why am I *obliged* to receive the gospels as my rule of faith and practice ? what other answer can be given on Mr. Norton's ground, than that they have the honest opinion of fallible men respecting the life and doctrines of Jesus Christ, and therefore they ought to adopt it ? If now such readers should rejoin

and say to Mr. Norton ; We have indeed their opinion or their account of these matters ; but inasmuch as you admit that they have “misapprehended” some things, “confounded” others, “misplaced” some, and “not sufficiently discriminated” in respect to others ; while you even admit that they have “blended fable and fiction together ;” how can we, who are not, like you, well-read critics, and have no knowledge of the original Scriptures, in any way distinguish between the cases which you thus present to our view, and those where you admit that mere and simple facts and truths are stated ?—if, I say, such questions should be asked, (and they certainly will be), then will Mr. Norton tell us what answer is to be given that will “stop the mouths of such gainsayers ?” I know of none. Where Mr. Norton doubts, he can be appealed to in many ways which are closed up with regard to such individuals as I have just described. But when *they* doubt, even after reading his book, whether to give their *practical* assent to Christianity, how are they to be made to feel the awful responsibility under which they place themselves by rejecting the word of the living God ?

But I am not writing against Mr. Norton’s theology, nor composing a polemical essay against skepticism. I will therefore desist. The importance of the subject ; the attitude in which Mr. Norton’s remarks have placed it ; and the obligation which lies upon every conscientious reviewer not to conceal things in a work the tendency of which he believes will be exceedingly hazardous ; have induced me to say thus much. I am sure Mr. Norton, with his desires of canvassing all subjects, and with his strenuous sentiments as it respects liberty to speak our opinions, will neither misconstrue nor take amiss what I have now said.

I have only to add, that the book is printed throughout with great correctness and elegance. A small number of mistakes in the typographical execution, an attentive perusal of the whole has discovered ; but they are too trifling to deserve mention. The press at Cambridge has few rivals indeed in this country, as to the correctness with which it executes its publications.

ARTICLE II.

THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH, HEAD OVER ALL THINGS ; ILLUSTRATED BY ANALOGIES BETWEEN NATURE, PROVIDENCE, AND GRACE.

By W. S. Tyler, Professor of Languages, Amherst College.

THE Head of the *church* is likewise "head over *all* things"—sovereign alike in the kingdom of nature, the kingdom of providence, and the kingdom of grace. He is "*God over all*"—the God of nature, of providence, and of grace. This is evidently a doctrine of *revelation*, directly asserted in many passages,* and clearly implied in the whole tenor of Scripture.

It is my present design to show, that *reason* teaches the same doctrine—that a rational and candid examination and comparison of the kingdoms of nature, providence and grace will lead us to the conclusion, that they have the same head. My arguments will be drawn from *Analogy*, "that powerful engine, which" as has been well said, "in the mind of a Newton, discovered to us the laws of all *other* worlds, and in that of Columbus, put us in full possession of our own ;" and which, it might have been added, in the mind of a Butler disclosed to us the indissoluble ties, that pervade the economy of the natural and the spiritual worlds. The analogies which run through nature, providence and grace, are such, as if not to establish the proposition, yet to create a strong presumption, that they have the same head, and are in fact but different provinces of the same empire—distinct departments of the same government.

The *principle* involved in this argument is so fully elucidated and so powerfully enforced by Butler in his "*Analogy*," as to be familiar to the memory, and convincing to the judgment, of every reader of that important work. He has left little for those, who come after him, to do, but to gather new *instances* of analogy and thus furnish fresh *illustrations* of the principle and additional confirmations of the argument. This field of investigation, which Butler merely *opened* to our view, is as boundless as the universe ; its treasures and wonders will be

* Eph. 1: 22. Rom. 9: 5.

exhausted only when the plan of God's universal government is fully developed and perfectly understood. Into this field my readers are now invited, with the promise, that if they discover nothing *new*, they shall see something, that cannot fail to be *interesting* to the admiring student of the divine works.

1. The first analogy, which I shall mention, respects the *qualifications* for *entering into* the kingdoms, whether to explore, or to enjoy them. In all these alike, the qualifications are *humility* and *faith*.

Without a humble and modest spirit, we are unprepared to investigate the question before us. On the outermost walls and gates of each of the kingdoms, which we are about to examine and compare, on every side is inscribed the motto: "Let no man enter here, save in the garb of humility." Bacon was the first to discover and apply this analogy. "The kingdom of men founded in science," he says, "is like the kingdom of heaven; no man can enter into it, except in the character of a little child." A child-like humility and docility was the key by which he opened the vestibule of nature, and in his "*Novum Organum*," he committed the same key into the hands of subsequent philosophers and commended it to them, as alone capable of unlocking every chamber and cloister in the spacious temple. It need scarcely be remarked that the same key is necessary and adequate to unlock the mysteries of *providence* and of *revelation*.

The book of nature, the book of providence, and the book of grace are severally *dedicated* to *children*. None but those who have the simplicity and docility, the humble and inquiring disposition of little children are permitted to read them. If others make the attempt, they cannot understand, still less relish their contents.

Without a figure, they who would *study* the system of nature, providence or grace, must come disposed and prepared, not to *determine* how things *should* be, but to *inquire* how things *are*; not to dogmatize and dictate, but to learn and obey; not to reason *a priori*, but to observe and infer. And they who would *live happily* under either system, must have a contented and submissive spirit, and wear the apparel of humility and modesty.

Faith in its *essential elements* sustains a relation to each of the three kingdoms akin to that which humility sustains. It is the *passport* for *admission*. Not a step can be taken in the study of nature or the observation of Providence, any more than

in the knowledge of revelation, without a belief in the divine veracity—in other words a belief that God will fulfil his tacit promise by maintaining a uniformity in his laws and plans of operation. It confers the right of *citizenship*. No man can be a useful or happy citizen in the kingdom of nature, providence, or grace, without combining with the *intellectual* belief just mentioned, a *heartfelt confidence* in the power, wisdom and goodness of the supreme Ruler of the Universe.

Hence it is, that true science and true religion mutually aid each other. Pure Christianity begets the confiding modesty yet eager hope of the philosopher; and sound philosophy fosters the humility and faith of the Christian. The philosopher believes any thing with evidence, nothing without; and so does the Christian. The Christian feels himself to be merely a humble inquirer at the oracles of God, with no authority to dictate, no power to control; and so does the philosopher. The proud and dogmatizing spirit of the old Greek philosophers was not more unchristian than it was unphilosophical; accordingly their knowledge of nature and providence was as crude as their notions of religion. The same spirit as exhibited by the modern schools of *a priori* reasoning is not more unphilosophical than it is unchristian; accordingly while most philosophers of the observing school have been believers in revelation, skepticism has made sad havoc among those of the school of reasoners *a priori*. The humble, inquiring and believing philosophy of Socrates made him almost a Christian *without* a revelation. The proud, dictating and dogmatizing philosophy of the German Neologist makes him an infidel *in spite* of revelation. We know not, whether the modesty of Newton partakes more largely of true religion or of sound philosophy. We know that Voltaire in his arrogance and conceit was neither a philosopher nor a Christian. The *humble believer*,—he it is in every age, that discovers the truths, beholds the wonders, and enjoys the blessings, of nature, providence and grace—he alone possesses the clue, that will conduct him through the labyrinth of the divine works. To return to the figure, with which this head was introduced, humility and faith, not exactly in their Christian forms but in their essential elements, are the passports for admission, and the qualifications for citizenship alike in the kingdom of nature, the kingdom of providence, and the kingdom of grace. This analogy, so interesting in itself, it was peculiarly appropriate and important, that we should notice at the commencement

of our inquiries. But we must not linger about the walls ; let us enter the kingdoms in the spirit of humble and believing inquirers, and we shall find secondly, that

2. They are all governed by *general laws*. This is a characteristic feature of the divine government. Human governments *multiply* statutes, and strive, but strive in vain, to enact an express law for every specific case. Each day gives birth to an unforeseen emergency, and calls for a new enactment. With the increase of population and national prosperity, the difficulty of legislation increases, till the uninterrupted exercise of legislative wisdom is insufficient to provide for the ever varying interests and relations of the people.

Suppose now some lawgiver should arise, who could comprise every specific right and duty and interest and relation in one simple, comprehensive law. How would he throw into the shade the far-famed lawgivers of antiquity, and the boasting legislators of the present day ! But Lycurgus and Solon may rest in peace in their glory ; and our representatives in the Legislative hall need indulge no fear of being superseded in their functions and prerogatives. Such a legislator never has arisen and never will appear.

Yet it is by such laws that the kingdoms of nature, providence and grace are governed. Take for examples the law of gravitation, the law of society, and the law of love.

The first regulates the relations and movements of every world and every atom in the *material* universe. The falling pebble and the rising mote, the descending rain and the ascending fog, the revolving planet, the eccentric comet and the central sun are alike subject to its sway.

The second regulates the relations and movements of every individual in *society*. Not a human being but feels the power of the social principle attracting him towards other human beings. None are so high as to be independent of the principle ; none so low as to escape its all pervading influence.

In like manner, the third regulates the relations and movements of every *Christian* in the *church*. However different their denominations and forms and ceremonies, however diverse their rank or talent, or dress, or deportment may be, just so far as they are Christians, all their thoughts and feelings and words and actions are controlled by one general law—the law of love. Thus the material, the social, the spiritual universe each has one general law, all-pervading, all-controlling and all-comprehensive.

And these laws bear a mutual analogy not only in their *universality*, but in their *nature*. They are all laws of *attraction*, of *association*, of *union*. There is a bond of society and of holy brotherhood in the natural as well as the moral world. It requires no very lively imagination to see in the planet and its satellites the emblem of a harmonious and happy family ; in the solar system, a larger circle of affectionate friends and neighbors ; in those groups of solar systems which revolve perhaps about some common centre, so many well regulated and well governed nations ; and in the universe of worlds all circling around the central throne of God, a counterpart of what the human race would be, did they but yield as perfect obedience to the law of their social and moral nature as the heavenly bodies render to the law of gravitation. On the other hand, what is holy love but a principle of attraction, a law of gravitation in the spiritual world, which unites individual Christians into particular churches, particular churches into the church universal, the church on earth to the spirits of the just made perfect in heaven, the whole general assembly and church of the first born, to the innumerable company of the angels, and all holy beings fast to the throne of the Most High !

Knit like the *social stars* in love,
Fair as the *moon* and clear
As yonder *sun* enthroned above,
Christians through life appear.

And in the future life, when the repelling and disturbing power of selfishness will be annihilated, oh, how strong will be the bond, how exquisite the harmony, how beautiful and blissful the union and sympathy, that pervades the church triumphant—the holy universe !

3. The laws in each kingdom are *self-executing*. This is another *characteristic* analogy, which pervades the various departments of the divine government.

In human governments, it is usually quite as difficult to *execute* the laws as to *make* them. The executive does not always understand them, sometimes wilfully misinterprets or fails to execute them ; and even when the agents of the government are well disposed and efficient men, they are utterly incapable either of securing perfect obedience to the laws, or of punishing every instance of disobedience. The man, who should devise a code of laws, that would execute themselves, would be an unrivalled benefactor to his species and would acquire for himself an imperishable renown.

Such now are the laws of nature, providence and grace. They are inwrought into the very constitution, stamped on the forehead, graven upon the heart of the subject. "I will put my law in their *inward parts* and write it upon their *hearts*." Such is the decree of heaven promulgated in relation to the kingdom of grace, and the realms of nature and providence are governed according to the same decree. Every subject yields obedience to the law from the necessity of his nature, or if in the exercise of free-agency, he disobeys, he cannot help the self-infliction of the penalty. Every man must obey the laws of his *physical* nature, or injure his health and shorten or destroy his life. He must obey the laws of his *social* nature, or torture himself, while he wrongs and provokes others. He must obey the laws of his moral and spiritual being, or conscience condemns and passion rages and consumes the offender.

Take the laws already specified, the law of gravitation, the law of society and the law of love. Obedience to each secures order and harmony, safety and beauty. Disobedience is *immediately* and *inevitably* followed by disorder, confusion and ruin. "The wreck of matter and the crush of worlds," which would attend a suspension of the law of attraction, is but a type of the jarring and collision of fiercer elements and the wreck and ruin of dearer interests, which are consequent upon a suspension of the social principle and the law of love. While on the other hand, the harmonious and beautiful order of the material universe as it is, is an emblem fit of the harmony, peace and happiness, that would pervade the spiritual world on condition of perfect obedience to the law of social reciprocity and universal benevolence.

"There's not an orb, which thou behold'st
But in his motion, like an *angel sings*
Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubims:
Such harmony is in *immortal souls*,
But while this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it."

4. There is a striking analogy in the *degree* and *manner* of *sovereignty* exercised in each of the kingdoms.

Does God make one creature an animalcule to float in the minutest drop of spray, and another a great whale to traverse the boundless ocean ; one a reptile to crawl in the dust, another

a lion to roam the monarch of the forest, and a third an eagle to soar above the clouds; the zoophyte scarcely to be distinguished from the senseless plant, and man to bear the image of his Maker and exercise in part the sovereignty of the universal Lord—without consulting at all the wishes of his creatures?

In like manner, his providence has cast one man's lot in the wilderness a wandering savage, and another's in the city amid luxury and refinement; has exalted one to sit king on a throne, and doomed another to toil a slave in the mines, has taught one to range the universe, "borne on thought's most rapid wing," and left another to confine his views to his native valley and his necessities to the supply of his bodily wants—and he has done all this without consulting the preference of the individuals concerned.

That a similar sovereignty is exercised in the kingdom of grace, need scarcely be stated, for it forms a standing objection to the administration of that realm. There too "it is not of him that *willeth* nor of him that runneth but of God, that sheweth mercy. The angels sin, and are all thrust down to the realms of darkness and despair. Man rebels, and an atonement is provided for his salvation. Yet only a part of mankind are destined to obtain eternal life, while the remainder are left to perish in their sins. Some are born to live and die heathen, while a Christian birth-right and inheritance fall to the lot of others.

There is no democracy, no levelling, no fear of distinctions in any part of God's government; and it is most unreasonable and inconsistent, that they, who have always recognized the exercise of absolute sovereignty in some parts of his government should be surprised to discover the same sovereignty in other parts, and that they, who find no fault with the principle in nature and providence, should consider the same principle an insuperable objection to the administration of divine grace.

There is an analogy also as to the manner in which or the *principle* on which the sovereignty is exercised. "I thank thee O Father, Lord of heaven and earth," says Christ, "that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes—even so Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." In like manner Paul says in relation to his own times. "Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called, but God hath chosen the foolish things of the

world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty, and base things of the world and things which are despised hath he chosen, yea and things which are not, to bring to nought things which are."

The great principle involved in both these passages is that the heirs of earthly good are not usually chosen to inherit spiritual blessings. And it is a principle, which pervades every department of God's government, that he seldom lavishes all his favors upon the same individuals. The treasures of nature, of providence, and of grace are all infinite, yet they are *meted out* with a sparing and a discriminating hand.

How liberal has *nature* been in the *provision* of her gifts, yet how parsimonious in the *distribution* of them! The sum total is beyond calculation, the dividend is usually small. Through the whole range of animals, how rarely are strength and agility combined, beauty and melody blended, cunning and courage united! The gaudy plumage of the peacock and the sweet voice of the nightingale never meet. The strength and ferocity of the lion do not coëxist with the cunning of the fox or the reason of man.

So Providence rarely allots learning to the king or rank to the scholar. He takes health and peace away from both, and makes them the portion of the obscure and illiterate peasant. The healthy are not usually the wealthy, nor the wealthy the wise. Solomon stands almost alone as at once the greatest, the richest and the wisest man in his kingdom. God has given to *tropical climes* beauty and fertility, but he has also given them the tempest and the tornado. He has doomed the inhabitants of temperate climes and mountainous regions to toil and fatigue, but he has rewarded them by "health, peace, and competence," and in like manner *Grace* has made exhaustless provision for our spiritual wants. Heaven was emptied of its choicest treasure and brightest glory to procure gifts for men, yet these gifts are not lavished upon those, who have already full hands and surfeited hearts. The Gospel was committed, not to the Literati at Rome, or the Rabbis at Jerusalem, but to the Fishermen of Galilee. It was preached unto the poor, and embraced by the humble and unlearned. It is the poor and hungry, the weeping and mourning, the despised and persecuted that inherit the christian beatitudes. If you would find the abodes of virtue and piety, you must go, not where

———the spicy breezes
Blow soft o'er Ceylon's isle,

And every prospect pleases,
And only man is vile ;

but to New England's rock bound coast and Iceland's frozen shores, the rugged mountains of Scotland, or the inaccessible fastnesses of the High Alps.

5. There is the same necessity for *active exertion* in each of the three kingdoms. Divine Sovereignty and human agency run parallel through nature, providence, and grace. It is the law of the kingdom of grace. "Work out your *own* salvation with fear and trembling, for it is *God* who worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." It is the law of providence, "God helps those, that help themselves," and the law of nature, "The *sun-shine* and the *plough* cover the valleys over with corn." "The blessing of the Lord, *it maketh* rich," naturally, intellectually spiritually rich, but not without "the hand of the diligent."

He, who would *explore the mysteries* of nature, providence and grace, must *study hard* ; and he must *labor hard*, who would secure and enjoy their *blessings*. In the sweat of his face man eats his bread. *This* life gives us nothing without great labor,* and strait is the gate and narrow the way, that leads to life everlasting. We must agonize to enter the kingdoms of nature and providence as well as the kingdom of grace—all alike suffer violence and the violent take them by force.

The divine agency may be more or less secret and inscrutable, and we may not be able to discern the connection between the *means* required of *man* and the end to be accomplished, yet both are absolutely essential to the accomplishment of the end. We cannot discover the manner of divine and human coöperation, yet is it an obvious fact, that without that coöperation, we can put forth no successful effort of body, mind or heart ; transact no important business in the natural or the spiritual world ; secure no valuable interest for time or eternity. The Creator's efficiency and the creature's responsibility, absolute dependance and entire free agency, run parallel throughout the natural and the moral universe.

6. There is the same apparent mixture of good and evil,

* Τῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν οὐδὲν ἄνευ πόρου καὶ ἐπιμελείας Θεοὶ διδούσιν ἀνθρώποις. Xenophon, Memorabilia. II. 1: 28.

Nil sine magno
Vita labore dedit mortalibus.—Horace Sat. 9. Lib. I.

order and confusion, light and darkness, in each of the three kingdoms.

Look where you will in this world, you see a chequered scene. The eye of man never rests on a spot of unmixed good or unmixed ill. Not a creature exists within the whole range of our observation, that does not drink a cup of mingled sweet and bitter. What *animal* ever lived and died without experiencing both pleasure and pain? *Man*, does he receive good at the hand of Providence, and does he not also receive evil? Nor is there a just man on earth, that *doeth* good and *sinneth* not. Natural good and natural evil, providential good and providential evil, spiritual good and spiritual evil every where commingle. Like opposite polarities, the existence of the one always indicates the existence of the other.*

Are there "wars and fightings" in the *spiritual world*? So there are in society. So there are in the animal kingdom. There is war every where on earth—there *was* war in heaven once. Natural, civil and ecclesiastical history are severally histories of alternate war and peace, battles and truces, cruel oppressions and cruel sufferings. "The *whole creation* groaneth and travaileth in pain *together*."

Does *slavery* exist in human society? So it does among the lower animals. White ants, like white men, capture their colored brethren, and doom them to involuntary, perpetual servitude.† And slavery exists in the spiritual world too.‡

Are there *earthquakes* in *nature*? There are also *moral* and *spiritual* earthquakes—convulsions which shake society and

* Plato in his *Phaedo*, speaking of pleasure and pain, says, "If any person pursues and receives the one, he is almost always under a necessity of receiving the other, as if both of them depended from one summit." *Phaedo*. III.

† See Nat. Hist. of Insects. Family Library, No. VIII. chap. 7. "The legionary ant is actually formed to be a slave-dealer, attacking the nests of other species, stealing their young, rearing them, and thus by shifting all the domestic labors of their republic on strangers, escaping from labor themselves. This curious fact, first discovered by Huber, has been confirmed by Latreille, and is admitted by all naturalists. The slave is distinguished from his master by being of a dark ash color, so as to be entitled to the name of negro. (*Formica fusca*.)"

‡ Rom. 6: 16. "His servants (slaves, *δοῦλοι*) ye are, to whom ye obey." John 8: 34. 1 Pet. 5: 8. Eph. 2: 2

the church to their foundations, and threaten to destroy their very existence.

Some churches sometimes exhibit a most lovely spectacle of *order* and *harmony* and peace. Such was the state of the church at Jerusalem in its infancy, when no man claimed or sought any thing as his own, none gloried in wealth, and none suffered from poverty; "and they continued daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness, and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people." But it was not always so with the church at Jerusalem or other apostolic churches. It was not long before Paul was under the necessity of rebuking the church at Corinth for such *disorders* as were "not even named among the Gentiles," and pronouncing the members "carnal" because of "*envyings, strifes and divisions* among them." There was envy and jealousy, cowardice and treachery in the chosen band of Christ's apostles. And none need be told, for every eye hath seen and every ear hath heard, how much there *now* is in the *church* of that strife, which is accompanied with "confusion and every evil work."

In like manner, there is here and there a regular and cheerful *family*, an orderly and quiet *community*, a peaceful and happy *nation*. But how often does *confusion* succeed order in these very families and communities and nations; or if not in the same, how does it prevail in others around them? Sometimes the good man prospers and the bad only suffers, but how often the tables are turned and the order reversed! And oftener still "one event happeneth to all."

In like manner in the *natural* world, there are deserts amid tropical verdure, and oases amid deserts. There is an *Ætna* in fertile Sicily, and a *Vesuvius* threatening the rich fields and blooming villages, and beautiful bay, of Naples. The tempest breaks in upon the sunshine, the earthquake succeeds the calm, and the blazing meteor, the streaming comet and the appearing and disappearing star *seem* to disturb the harmony of the higher heavens. Throughout the divine economy, strange disorder and confusion are set over against exquisite order and harmony.

It is a common complaint of deists that there is *obscurity* in the Bible, and *mystery* in the whole scheme of grace. But is there no obscurity in the *deist's* Bible, no mystery in the divine economy, which the deist acknowledges? Had the economy of grace been all light and brightness, it would have been too

unlike the constitution and course of nature, to be referable to the same author. Now, where in God's works, is there not obscurity and mystery? I may find such a spot in *another* world, but I never have in this. There is light everywhere, but only enough to make the darkness visible; and the more light there is, the more we are sensible of the darkness, just as the larger the sphere illumined by a lamp in the open air at midnight, the more extensive is the concavity of darkness, by which it is enveloped. There never has been a day in this world, which did not answer in some respects the description of the prophet: "It shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear nor dark—not day nor night." There is light enough in nature, providence and grace severally, to guide us in all matters of practical utility or necessity, but if you would explore further, you enter the region of darkness. If you look downwards, you can only penetrate the surface, only examine a few scratches in the rind of the earth. If you look around you, every mineral is a cabinet of wonders, every plant a natural labyrinth, every animal a microcosm of mysteries, and of every element, it may be said as of the wind, "thou canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth." If you turn your eye upwards, the stars twinkle very far, but you know not how far above your head, their dimensions and velocities are very great, but how great in most cases none can tell, while as to the specific purposes, which they are made to subserve, you are left to mere conjecture.

And the deist's *New Testament*, the book of *providence*, is there less mystery in that, than in the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? Then why all those anxieties and perplexities and murmurings and repinings, of which the mouths of worldlings and the books of infidels are full?

It is this mixture of good and evil, order and confusion, light and darkness, which gives such a color of plausibility to the most opposite views of our world. Voltaire looks only at the dark side of the picture, and uses the following language of complaint. "Who can without horror consider the whole world as the empire of destruction! It abounds with wonders; it abounds also with victims. It is a vast field of carnage and contagion. Every species is without pity pursued and torn to pieces through the earth and air and water.

"In man there is more wretchedness, than in all the other

animals put together. He loves life, and yet he knows that he must die. If he enjoys a transient good, he suffers various evils, and is at last devoured by worms. This knowledge is his fatal prerogative—all other animals have it not. He spends the transient moments of his existence in diffusing the miseries he suffers, in cutting the throats of his fellow creatures for pay, in cheating and being cheated, in robbing and being robbed, in serving that he might command, and in repenting of all he does. The bulk of mankind are a crowd of wretches equally criminal and unfortunate, and the globe contains rather carcasses than men. I tremble on the review of this dreadful picture to find that it contains a complaint against providence itself, and I wish I had never been born."

Paley looks chiefly at the bright side of the picture, and says; "It is a happy world, after all. The air, the earth, the water, teem with delighted existence. In a spring noon or a summer's eve, on whichever side I turn my eyes, myriads of happy beings crowd upon my view. Swarms of new-born flies are trying their pinions in the air. Their sportive motions, their wanton mazes, their gratuitous activity, their continual change of place without use or purpose testify their joy and the exultation which they feel in their newly discovered faculties. . . . If we look to what the waters produce, shoals of the fry of fish frequent the margins of rivers, of lakes, and of the sea itself. These are so happy that they know not what to do with themselves. . . . A child is delighted with speaking without knowing any thing to say, and with walking without knowing where to go. The young are happy in enjoying pleasure, the old are happy when free from pain." Halyburton in the midst of affliction and in full view of death looks on the same side and exclaims, "Oh, blessed be God that I was born. I have a father and mother and ten brothers and sisters in heaven, and I shall be the eleventh. Oh, there is a telling in this providence, and I shall be telling it forever. If there be such a *glory* in his conduct towards me now, what will it be to see the Lamb in the midst of the throne! Blessed be God, that ever I was born."

Now were not the present such a mixed state of things as I have described, *different* views might be taken of it, but not views *diametrically opposite*, yet both apparently just and true. And God makes use of this very mixture of good and evil to test and develope and form character. There is such a pre-

ponderance of *good* in *nature*, as to furnish presumptive evidence of the goodness of its author, but such a mixture of *evil* as to give scope for the developement of a heart of unbelief and discontent. There is such a preponderance of *order* and *justice* in the *providential* government of this world as to create a presumption, that God is just, but such a mixture of *disorder* and *injustice* as to afford a strong argument for a future state. There is such a preponderance of *light* in the Bible, as to satisfy a reasonable mind of its truth and sacredness, but such a mixture of *darkness* as to let the perverse heart wander and cavil, and despise and perish. It would seem as if God intended in this universal analogy to present us everywhere with the most sensible and striking proof, that he reigns alike in the realms of nature, providence and grace, and that we are now living in a state of trial, the issue of which will be a state of unmixed good or unmixed ill in another world. But this leads me to a seventh analogy :

7. In nature, providence and grace alike, God brings good out of evil, order out of confusion, light out of darkness.

It has been already intimated, that character is better tested and developed in a mixed state. There can be no trial of faith, in a world of such effulgent light, as enforces belief. No trial of patience, where there are not ills to provoke impatience. And reason accords with revelation in pronouncing the trial of these virtues to be more precious than that of silver and gold.

None could avoid admiring a state of perfect *order*. Voltaire, though he might have been of a discontented spirit, would not have *vented* his feelings in such loud and eloquent complaints, had no disorders or evils met his eye ; and though Paley might have been benevolent and cheerful, and Halyburton pious at heart, yet they could have given comparatively little *evidence* of such a character, had they never seen any thing but goodness and happiness in the world around them. In such a world, the three men could never have *seen* so clearly *themselves*, or exhibited so conspicuously to others, the radical difference in their characters.

But more than this is true. A mixture of good and evil is essential to the *formation* of a highly excellent or deeply depraved character by beings constituted as we are. Our physical, intellectual and moral powers are all strengthened by severe trial and discipline, and to this feature of our own constitution, the

structure of the world around us is nicely adapted. It is in no small degree a world of barrenness and thorns, a world of obscurity and mystery, a world of temptation and sin. We may and do perfect our natures by struggling with, and overcoming such obstacles. Physical strength is derived, not from the easy chair in the parlor, but from ploughing and hoeing the earth, swinging the axe or belaboring the anvil. Intellectual power and acumen are not received without effort in the nursery or the lecture room, but acquired by delving in the mines and separating the gold from the ore. Moral and religious principle becomes firm and decided, not in the select circle of virtue and piety, but in the wide world of temptation and sin. Thus the natural and spiritual worlds resemble, and conspire with, each other in the developement and formation of character in the only way adapted to our constitution and state of probation, viz. by such a mixture of good and evil as shall leave us at full liberty to choose a right or a wrong course and furnish us at once the means, which are necessary to aid our progress in the way of our choice, and the obstacles, the removal of which by continued effort is necessary to develop our powers and confirm our habits.

In the same manner and probably for the same end the *sciences* have exerted alternately good and bad influences on religious character. Like the three kingdoms of which they constitute the history and the philosophy, they are partly light and partly darkness, and they have shed upon religion, now light and now darkness. Now they have raised objections, and now they have removed those objections, and furnished contrary and corroborating evidence. Such has been the history of every science, theology not excepted. Accordingly different men have found in the same science, one nutriment for his faith and another support for his skepticism, one the means of perfecting his excellencies, another of deepening his depravity.*

Another way, in which good is brought out of evil in all the departments of the divine government, is by the increased value which good acquires or seems to acquire by *contrast* with evil. The fertile field never appears so rich as when contrasted with

* It is not denied, that *true* science has sometimes been perverted into an engine of irreligion and immorality. But it is more frequently the errors which are engrafted upon the science, that do the mischief.

the barren desert. How does the hungry and thirsty, weary and wayworn traveller through the interminable prairie or the boundless Sahara, revel in the shades and fountains and fruits and flowers of the wooded island or the verdant oäsis ! None, but he who has suffered a long confinement in the narrow streets and infected atmosphere of a populous city, knows the luxury of life in the fresh green country.

It is so with *providential* good. If you are ever grateful for health, it is when you have visited a hospital and had your heart wrung with sympathy for the afflicted and distressed inmates ; and if you ever enjoy the blessings of health with a keen, a peculiar relish, it is when you have yourself just risen from a bed of painful and protracted sickness. You set the highest value upon your knowledge, when you view it in contrast with the ignorance of others, or perhaps with your own former ignorance. It is so with *spiritual* good. When the Christian looks "at the rock whence he was hewn and the hole of the pit, whence he was digged," and sees others still cleaving to the hardness of impenitency and sinking in the mire of pollution, then it is that he sings the loudest, most enrapturing song of praise to his God and Redeemer. Heaven is the traveller's resting place and the pilgrim's home, the warrior's peace and the runner's goal, perpetual health to the diseased, and eternal life to the dying, confirmed holiness to the sinner, and perfected bliss to the miserable ; and through eternity the joys of the redeemed will be enhanced and their notes of praise swelled immeasurably by looking back upon the sins and miseries of earth, and looking down upon the torments and blasphemies of hell.*

But evil is also made throughout the divine government the *direct means* of preventing a greater evil or accomplishing a greater good. The volcano is often a terrible scourge to its immediate vicinity, but it gives vent to those internal fires which would otherwise shake continents and lay waste nations. France

* The songs of the redeemed in the Revelation are chiefly songs of *deliverance* in view of the dreadful and final *overthrow* of the wicked. In making such representations, the ministers of the Gospel and the sacred writers are often charged with a fiendish delight in the miseries of others. But it is nothing more, than that joy and gratitude, which we *always* and *necessarily* feel in *contrasting* our *enjoyments* with our *deserts*, our *present* happiness with our *former* misery, or our *own* weal with the *wo* of others.

in the last century was a *political* and *moral* volcano. Anarchy and infidelity broke out there in such frightful ravages and convulsions, as to put an effectual check upon the risings and heavings of other nations, and to furnish a safeguard to society and the church in every subsequent age of the world. And who can say, that our world is not the vent of sin for the moral universe, designed to exert a conservative influence over thousands of worlds and myriads of intelligent beings through endless ages.*

The lightning and the tempest often ravage the earth and destroy human life, but they also purify the atmosphere and prevent it from becoming fatal on a larger scale. So the judgments of heaven reform individuals, purify churches, correct social habits and improve national character.

The modern Italian derives subsistence and pleasure from the surface of the lava, that entombed Herculaneum and Pompeii; Europe owed the revival of letters not a little to the destruction of Constantinople; and the Gentile world were indebted to the persecution of the church at Jerusalem for the general propagation of the Gospel. Indeed if there is any truth in natural, political and ecclesiastical history, convulsions have been a principal means of fertilizing and beautifying the surface of the earth; revolutions, of reforming and advancing society; and persecutions, of purifying and enlarging the church. Who is not struck with the peculiar wisdom, that originated this plan of operation, and the symmetry, that extended it to every department of the divine government?†

Slavery, that scourge of Africa and curse and disgrace of the nations that have sanctioned it, has it *done* no good? To say nothing of the conversion and salvation of thousands, that would otherwise have lived and died in heathenism, what else has pro-

* That the influence of the fall *together with the scheme of recovery* is not confined to our world, is clear from such passages as the following. Luke 15: 10. Col. 1: 20. 1 Cor. 4: 9. Eph. 3: 20. That it should affect all moral beings accords with all our ideas of moral influence, and to suppose that it *does*, gives new grandeur to the scheme of moral government and to the plan of redemption.

† This feature of the divine government does not justify the radical reformer, any more than the cruel persecutor. The divine plan may be wise, and the divine purpose good, while yet there is neither wisdom nor goodness in the human agency.

duced or could have produced that unparalleled sympathy and excitement in behalf of Africa, which has led so many white missionaries to breathe her pestilential airs and lay their bones on her burning sands ; and what else has sent back so many of her own sons, civilized, enlightened and redeemed to build up nations on her coasts and spread the blessings of knowledge, society and religion through the countless heathen tribes of the interior ?

And the evil one himself,—has he not been the means of doing good ? *He* too has occasioned a sympathy in behalf of *his* wretched victims through all the heavenly hosts, and “ there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons, that need no repentance.” When he drove on his slaves to crucify the son of God, he helped to execute a scheme, which the angels desire to look into, and which all holy beings will study and contemplate with ineffable wonder, love and joy forever and ever.

The *animal kingdom*, which is sometimes represented as a mere scene of carnage and cruelty, is a scheme of comprehensive wisdom and goodness ; and the existence of carnivorous and venomous animals, so far from a blemish, is the wisest and best and most wonderful part of the scheme. Venomous animals rarely attack other species except for purposes of defence or subsistence. Now what more effectual means of defence against the larger animals could be devised, than their venomous bite or sting ; and what other way of destroying their smaller prey would be so sudden, so easy, and attended with so little pain !

The destruction of many animals is absolutely necessary to prevent such a multiplication of them, as would exhaust vegetation and subject not only the whole animal kingdom, but man himself to a lingering, torturing death by famine. Now how profound, how superhuman is the wisdom, which makes this necessary destruction, the means of subsistence and happiness to another class of animals, that execute it in a manner far less painful to the victims, than the slow tortures of famine, disease or old age ! But for the comforts of society, the pleasures of intellect, and the hopes and fears of immortality, it would be better for man to die in the same way. As it is his reason which exempts him from the scheme of animal destruction, so it is his rational and immortal nature only, which renders it *de-*

sirable that he should be exempted. Thus without any loss on the whole, but rather the reverse, to the *herbivorous* tribes, the happiness of the *carnivorous* species is clear gain to the sum total of animal enjoyment.*

Now it is a doctrine of christian theology, that the sum total of moral as of natural good is enhanced by the existence of evil. We cannot see so clearly how this result is effected in the moral as in the natural world, hence there is some dispute as to the *manner*. But as to the *fact*, there can be no doubt.† The Bible implies it,‡ and we see enough of the *process* to satisfy a reasonable mind. The sins and temptations of a wicked world give occasion for the exercise of some virtues, which could not otherwise exist, and discipline other virtues to a degree of strength and perfection, which they could not otherwise attain. Earth with all its barrenness and thorns and briars, is the very soil for faith and patience and charity to bloom in and bear their precious harvest of golden fruit.

Without the existence of evil, there could not be the luxury, to us unequalled, of contemplating our deliverance and praising our Deliverer. The beauties of the Redeemer's character and the glories of redemption could have been exhibited only in a theatre of sin and misery. Other worlds may owe their continued allegiance to our apostacy, their further progress in knowledge and holiness to our folly and guilt; and the holy universe will understand the nature, perceive the beauty, and enjoy the pleasures of holiness far more than if sin and misery had never existed.

As in the natural world, destruction and pain afford the means of subsistence and pleasure, so in the spiritual world, sin and misery furnish nutriment to holiness and happiness; and as the happiness of carnivorous animals is clear gain without any loss to the herbivorous, so without doing the wicked any wrong, the Head of the church will by their means greatly enhance the holiness and happiness of his people, while he makes a matchless display of his own wisdom and goodness. Thus he causes all

* For authority and more extended discussion on this subject, the reader may refer to Paley's Nat. Theol. chap. 26. and Buckland's Bridg. Treat. chap. 13.

† Theologians of all parties agree, that evil is in *some way*, or for *some reason*, incidental to the best system.

‡ Rom. 3: 5—7. 5: 20. 11: 11, 12, 32, 33, etc.

the wrath of the elements and animals and men and devils to praise him and to work together for the good of the universe ; and we only need clearer eyes, larger minds and better hearts to see every apparent evil in every department of the divine government producing real good.

"All nature is but art unknown to thee,
All chance, direction which thou canst not see,
All discord, harmony not understood,
All partial evil, universal good."

[To be concluded.]

ARTICLE III.

FRATERNAL APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN CHURCHES, TOGETHER WITH A PLAN FOR CATHOLIC UNION ON APOSTOLIC PRINCIPLES.*

By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in the Theol. Sem. of General Synod of the Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Penn. [Concluded from p. 131.]

WHILST contemplating the church of the Redeemer from the time when the Master tabernacled in the flesh, to the present day, we are, as was formerly remarked, forcibly struck by the contrast between her visible unity in the earlier centuries, and the multitude of her divisions since the Reformation. During the former period, the great mass of the orthodox christian community on earth, constituted one universal or catholic church ; excepting only several comparatively small clusters of Christians, such as the Donatists and Novatians. Now, the purest portion of God's heritage, the Protestant world, is cleft into a multitude of parties, each claiming superior purity, each maintaining a separate ecclesiastical organization. The separation of the Protestants from the Papal hierarchy, was an insuperable duty ; for Rome had poisoned the fountains of truth by her corruptions, and death or a refusal to drink from her cup was the only alternative. "Babylon, the great, was fallen"

* To the substance of this article, which, (as stated in the last No. of the *Repository*, p. 86, was prepared a year ago,) a few paragraphs only have been added in view of more recent events.

under the divine displeasure, and "the voice from heaven" must be obeyed, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues."* But that the Protestants themselves should afterwards separate from each other; should break communion with those whom they professed to regard as brethren, was inconsistent with the practice of the apostolic church, and, at least in the extent to which it was carried, and the principle on which it was based, detrimental to the interests of the christian cause. But it must not be forgotten, that the position thus assumed, was, so far as its ulterior results are concerned, rather adventitious than designed. The Protestant churches struggled into existence amid circumstances of excitement, oppression and agitation both civil and ecclesiastical. This state of things was highly unpropitious alike to the formation of perfect views of church polity in theory, and their introduction in practice. The Reformation itself, could not have been effected, unless aided by the civil arm, which protected its agents from papal vengeance. A total exclusion of the civil authorities from ecclesiastical action, would probably have blasted the Reformation in the bud; even if the views of the earlier Reformers had led them to desire such exclusion. Owing partly to these circumstances, and partly to the remains of papal bigotry still adhering to them, the Protestants in different countries successively assumed organizations not only entirely separate, as in some respects they properly might be; but having little reference to the church as a whole, and calculated to cast into the back ground the fundamental unity which actually exists between them. Without entering into a detail of their origin, it may not be amiss, in view of the popular reader, to advert to the successive dates of their formation.

The *Lutheran church* grew up with the Reformation itself, which commenced in 1517. The early history of the one, in Germany, Denmark, Prussia, Sweden, and Norway is also the history of the other. The commencement of the church may be dated, either from 1520, when Luther renounced his allegiance to popery, by committing the emblems of papal power, the bulls and canons, to the flames; or, more properly it may be fixed at 1530, when the reformers presented their confession of faith, to the emperor and diet at Augsburg. It is to be regretted, that this eldest branch of the Protestant church adopt-

* Rev. 18: 3, 4.

ed a sectarian name ; thus fostering excessive reverence for the opinions of an illustrious yet fallible servant of God, erecting them into a standard of orthodoxy, and making his doctrinal attainments the *ne plus ultra* of ecclesiastical reformation. For, the church being termed Lutheran, it was a very popular argument, which bigots did not fail to wield, that he who rejected any of Luther's opinions was untrue to the church which bore his name. Had some generic designation been assumed, and only generic principles been adopted for the organization of the church, the work of reformation might have been gradually advanced until every vestige of popery was obliterated, without hurling the charge of unfaithfulness at any one. Yet, it is but justice to that distinguished servant of God to add, that the name was given to his followers by his enemies from derision, whilst he protested against it with his accustomed energy. "I beg (said he) that men would abstain from using my name, and would call themselves not Lutherans, but Christians. What is Luther? My doctrine is not mine. Neither was I crucified for any one. Paul would not suffer Christians to be called after him, nor Peter, but after Christ (1 Cor. 3: 4, 5). Why should it happen to me, poor, corruptible food of worms, that the disciples of Christ should be called after my abominable name? Be it not so, beloved friends, but let us extirpate party names, and be called Christians ; for it is the doctrine of Christ that we teach."

The *German Reformed church* was next established through the agency of that distinguished servant of Christ, Zwingli. He commenced his public efforts as a Reformer in 1519, by opposing the sale of indulgences by the Romish agent Sampson. In 1531 a permanent religious peace was made in Switzerland, securing mutual toleration both to the reformed and to the Catholics, and thus stability was given to this portion of the Protestant Church.

The *Episcopal church* may be dated from 1533, when Henry VIII. renounced his allegiance to the pope, and separated the church of England from the papal see ; although the work of actually reforming this church was accomplished at a later date.

The *Baptist church* may be referred to the year 1535, when Menno Simon commenced his career ; or to 1536, when it was regularly organized.

The *Calvinistic or Presbyterian church*, using the phrase to designate the church established by Calvin himself, may be

dated at 1536, when he was appointed minister at Geneva, or more properly at 1542 when he established the presbytery there.

The *Presbyterian church* in England, Scotland and America, may be regarded as a continuation of the church, founded by this eminent servant of God.

The *Congregational or Independent church* may be dated from 1616, when the first Independent or Congregational church was organized in England by Mr. Jacob.

The modern *Moravian church* or church of the *United Brethren*, may be regarded as originating in 1727, when Count Zinzendorf and Baron Waterville were selected as directors of the fraternity. Both the Moravian and the Baptist churches trace their origin to christian communities prior to the Reformation. But our design is merely to enumerate the dates of the existing most extensive Protestant denominations; in doing which, we have selected the earliest periods, in order that readers of no particular church might dissent or feel aggrieved.

The origin of the *Methodist church* may be traced to 1729, when its honored founder Mr. John Wesley, and Mr. Morgan commenced their meetings for the practical study of the sacred volume.

Numerous other denominations of minor extent, are found among us, whose principles coincide more or less with those of the churches here specified. All these together constitute the aggregate Protestant church, and are the great mass of the visible church of the Redeemer, engaged in promoting his mediatorial reign on earth, and owned by his Spirit's blessing.

Causes of sectarian strife between the different branches of the Protestant church.

In continental Europe the sectarian principle is not exhibited in its full development. There, either the Lutheran or Reformed church, and in some instances both are established by law; and the number of dissenters, if any exist, is very small. In England, where a greater amount of liberty is enjoyed, and the press is unshackled, dissenters from the established church are far more numerous. But it is only in these United States, where Christianity has been divorced from the civil government, and restored to its primitive dependence on its own moral power, that all sects are on perfect equality, and the natural tendency of sectarianism is witnessed in its full latitude. The separation between church and state is worthy of all praise, and demands

our warmest gratitude to Heaven. It has restored the American Protestant church to the original advantages of the golden age of Christianity in the apostolic days. In this land of refuge for oppressed Europe, God has placed his people in circumstances most auspicious for the gradual "perfecting" of his visible kingdom. Here we are enabled, unencumbered by entangling alliances with civil government, to review the history of the Redeemer's kingdom for eighteen hundred years, to trace the rise and progress of error in all its forms, to witness the effects of every different measure, and by a species of experimental eclecticism, rejecting every thing injurious, to combine all that has proved advantageous, and incorporate it in the structure and relations of the Protestant church. And has not God, in his providence called us to this work? Has he not, by our peculiar situation imposed on us this obligation? Ought not every man, be he minister or layman, who wields any influence in any christian denomination, strive to rise to the level of this sublime undertaking, and inquire: Whence originates the strife among the different branches of the Protestant church; and how may their union on apostolic principles be most successfully effected? Among the causes of this strife we may enumerate the following:

1. *The absence of any visible bond, or indication of union, between the different churches in any city, town or neighborhood, whilst each of them is connected to other churches elsewhere of their own denomination.* This circumstance constantly cherishes the unfriendly conviction, that each church prefers other distant churches to their own neighboring brethren. If the churches were all independent, having no closer connexion with any others abroad, than with their neighbors at home, there would be less occasion for this feeling. No bond of outward union at all, would be more conducive to brotherly love among neighbors, than a bond which excludes those around, us and unites us to others afar off. The effect of this stimulant to apathy or disregard between neighboring disciples of the same Saviour is witnessed in our cities, which contain several churches of the same denomination, united by a common confession and by their Synodical or Presbyterial relations. How much nearer do the churches of the same denomination feel to each other, than to other sects not thus connected, though equally and sometimes more contiguous!

2. The next cause of strife among churches is *their separate organization on the ground of doctrinal diversity.* Separate

organization becomes necessary in any association whose members are numerous, and spread over a large extent of country. This is no less the case in church than in state. But the most natural ground of division among those professedly belonging to the same great family, and aiming at the same ends, is geographical proximity ; as is seen in the division of our common country into States and these again into counties, and as existed in the christian church in the apostolic age. But when the division is made according to a principle totally different from this, when it is actually made on the ground of difference between certain portions of this common family ; it constantly holds up to view not only the existence of some difference, but also the fact, that this difference is so important, as to require those entertaining it to separate from one another. Now as of two conflicting opinions only one can be true ; it also implies, that each party regards the other as in important error, and that itself professes superior purity. This is virtually judging our brother, and perpetuating the recollection of our judgment by founding on it a peculiarity in the structure of our ecclesiastical organization. This circumstance is obviously calculated to beget unfriendly feelings, and to cherish bigotry ; and its effect will be proportioned to the density and exclusiveness of the organization based on it. In the primitive church, when no different denominations of Christians existed, but all professors of Christianity, of contiguous residence, whether they entirely agreed in opinion or not, belonged to the same church ; the bigotry and pride of the human heart found food only in the separate interests of neighboring churches occupying different ground. But to this is now unhappily added the conflict of interests resulting from the occupancy of the same ground by two churches, as also the conflicting interests of separate extended ecclesiastical organizations, aiming to occupy the same location.

3. The third source of sectarian strife, may be found in the use of *transfundamental creeds*.* We have already seen that creeds properly constructed are useful in the church. We believe it may easily be established, that either in written or oral form they are essential. They existed in the primitive church in the latter form, and were productive of good and only good. They were soon reduced to writing in the so-called Apostles'

* By transfundamental creeds we would designate those creeds which embody not only the undisputed doctrines of Christianity, but also the sectarian peculiarities of some particular denomination.

creed, and served as a bond of union during the first four centuries of the church, among all who held the fundamentals of truth. But at that time creeds were confined to fundamentals. Neither the Apostles' nor the Nicene creed amounts to more than a single octavo page; and to the whole of the former and most of the latter all the different orthodox churches of the present day could subscribe. That the brevity of these creeds did not arise from the absence of diversity of views is certain. It has been proved in a former part of this Appeal, that there did exist differences of opinion, even in the apostolic age, on some points, regarded by us as highly important. To that evidence, fully satisfactory because derived from God's infallible word, we would here subjoin a highly important passage from Origen, to prove that such diversities of opinion continued to characterize the church from that day till the middle of the third century, at which time he wrote. The apostolic fathers also, would afford us important testimony on this point. Their writings have, indeed, reached us in a corrupted state; yet enough remains fully to answer our purpose; for the differences which they endeavor to allay must have existed. We shall, however, confine ourselves to the passage from Origen, which we believe has not before been presented to the American public. Origen, let it be borne in mind, was the most learned christian writer who had appeared from the time of the apostles. He was born but eighty-five years after St. John's death, and therefore may have seen persons who lived in the apostolic age. The infidel Celsus had asserted, that in the beginning, when Christians were few in number, there was unanimity on all points, but that in his day, the latter part of the second century (A. D. 176), they differed on many subjects. The following is Origen's reply: "But he (Celsus) also asserts, that they (the primitive Christians) all agreed in their opinions; not observing that from the beginning there were different opinions among believers (Christians) as to the selection of the books to be regarded as divine. Moreover, whilst the apostles were yet preaching, and those who were eye-witnesses were teaching the things which they had learned of Jesus, there was not a little dispute among the Jewish believers, concerning those gentiles who embraced the christian doctrines, whether it was their duty to observe the Jewish rites; or whether the burden of clean and unclean meats might not be removed, as unnecessary, from those among the gentiles who abandon the customs of their fa-

thers and believe in Jesus. And in the epistles of Paul we perceive that in the time of those who had seen Jesus, some were found who called in question the resurrection, and disputed whether it had not already taken place ; and also concerning the day of the Lord, whether it was just at hand or not ; and that (admonition) to avoid profane, vain babblings and the oppositions of knowledge falsely so called, which some professing, have made shipwreck concerning the faith ; hence it is manifest that from the very beginning certain differences of opinion occurred, at a time when (as Celsus supposes) the number of the believers was yet small. Then, when discoursing about the differences of opinion amongst Christians, he upbraids us, saying that when the Christians became numerous and were scattered abroad, they were repeatedly split up and cut into parties, each wishing to maintain their own position, and then (he adds)—dividing again, and quarrelling among themselves : until, so to speak, they agreed in only one thing, that is, in name, if even for shame's sake they still have this left in common ; but that in all other things they differ. To this we reply, that there never has been a subject, whose principles are of any moment and of importance in life, concerning which different opinions have not existed. Thus, because medicine is useful and necessary to the human family, there are many disputed points in it, relating to the different modes of curing the diseased. Hence different parties (schools or systems) in medicine are confessedly formed among the Greeks, and I believe also among such of the barbarous nations as avail themselves of the healing art. And again, because philosophy professes to teach the truth and instructs us in a knowledge of the things which exist, and how we ought to live, and aims at showing what will be advantageous to our race, it has many topics of dispute. Hence in philosophy also, there are very many parties (systems, schools,) some more and others less distinguished.”*

Here, then, we have the testimony alike of the most distin-

* Origenes contra Celsum, pp. 120, 121. edit. Hoeschelii.—It is evident from the context, and certain from history, that Origen when speaking of numerous differences among the Christians of his day, uses the word *αἵρεσις* to signify diversities of opinion, or systems of opinions and parties maintaining them, without any separate ecclesiastical organization based on them, and without interruption of sacramental and ministerial ecclesiastical intercommunion of the parties. We have accordingly thus rendered it in the version in the text.

guished infidel and Christian of the second and third century, to the existence of differences of opinion (not separate ecclesiastical organizations) in the christian church; yet at that time the only creed which it was deemed proper to use, was that termed the Apostles' creed. In short, there is no doubt, that the different so called orthodox Protestant churches, are in reality as much united in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as the church in the earlier centuries was. But modern creeds instead of giving prominence to this unity, and preserving it by adding a few sentences to these venerable ancient confessions, in order to exclude the fundamental errors which have sprung up since the fourth century, are swelled some to fifty and some to a hundred times their size!! Thus they necessarily introduce so many minor points of doctrine and opinion, that few of the members of the churches professing them do in reality believe all their contents! When the minor points of difference are embodied in a creed, they become the stereotyped characteristics of a new sect, and enlist in their defence many of the unsanctified principles of our nature. They become wedges of dissension to split in pieces the body of Christ, they form permanent barriers of division and bulwarks of schism in his church.

4. The fourth cause of alienation among Christians is the *sectarian training of the rising generation*. No principle is more fully established in the philosophy of mind, no fact more uniformly attested by the experience of ages, than that the impressions of early life are most lasting, that the prejudices of childhood and youth pursue us through every subsequent period of life. And whoever faithfully traces to its source the sectarian alienation of Christians will, we think, be constrained to attribute much of it to early sectarian training.

How often do not many parents in the presence of their children, exhibit their prejudices against other religious denominations? How much more frequently do they exalt their own denomination above all others, either directly or by comparative allusions? Are there not some parents, and alas that it should be so! some pastors too, who strive more by direct effort to instil a disregard for others and a preference for their own sect into the minds of children, long before they are competent to comprehend or estimate the grounds of the supposed preference? What else is this than an effort to sow the seeds of sheer prejudice in the tender minds of children? It is right that the prepossessions and antipathies of youth should be not indeed excited,

but properly directed ; yet, for the bleeding Saviour's sake, let the former be enlisted in the favor of Christianity, not of sectarianism, and the latter be directed against the enemies of the cross, and not against those whom we profess to acknowledge as its friends !

5. The next source of alienation among Christians, is what may be termed *sectarian idolatry* or *man-worship*, inordinate veneration for distinguished theologians, such as Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Wesley and others. What candid man, possessing any extensive acquaintance with the literature of past ages, can deny that the deference awarded to the opinions and practice of these men, is altogether inordinate, entirely beyond what is due to the merits of other men, and far above the measure of their actual superiority. Protestants justly censure the Romish church for reposing such confidence in the authority of the ancient Fathers, that is, of distinguished theologians of the first four or five centuries of the christian church. Yet it may be doubted whether some Protestants have not inadvertently conceded to some of these modern Fathers an influence somewhat similar, possibly in a few cases even equal in degree. The names of these good and great yet fallible men, have become identified with certain distinguishing non-fundamental doctrines which they held, and by which they were distinguished from others. Their authority and influence, acquired by their zeal and success in behalf of the common Christianity, are thus often used as a shield of protection for these minor peculiarities. The very designation of these peculiarities by personal names, calls into play sectarian associations, and sinister feelings, and is a kind of covert appeal to the authority of these Fathers.

Moreover each sect is prone to cultivate almost exclusively the literature of its own denomination. Enter the theological schools or the private libraries of ministers, and you will find that generally Lutherans and Calvinists and Episcopalians and Baptists and Methodists, devote most of their time to the study of authors of their own denominations, and this peculiarity may also be distinctly traced in the libraries of many lay Christians. Many of these distinguished servants of God would have grieved to think of the sectarian use, which posterity has made of their names and literary labors. Listen to the language of Luther, whose name and works were for two centuries especially thus employed in Germany for purposes of strife : " I had cherished

the hope, that henceforth men would apply to the holy Scriptures themselves, and let my books alone ; as they have now accomplished their end and have conducted the hearts of men to the Scriptures, which was my design in writing them. What profit is there in the making of many books, and yet remaining ignorant of the book of books. Better far to drink out of the fountain itself, than out of the little rivulets which have conducted you to it.*—Whoever now wishes to have my books, I entreat him by no means to let them be an obstacle to his studying the Scriptures themselves. But let him look upon my books, as I do on the decretals of the popes and books of the sophists, that is, though I occasionally look into them to see what they performed, and to examine the history of the times, I by no means study them under the impression, that I must do as they teach.† Yet there is reason to fear, that some good men have by early and long continued training become so much accustomed to test and value their views, rather as being Lutheran or Calvinistic than biblical, have so long been in the habit of dwelling on the conformity of their sentiments to those of Luther, Calvin, Wesley, or some other worthy of the church, that they would feel deeply distressed and almost lost, if these names were wrested from them ! In the spirit of such sectarianism we might commiserate the condition of the primitive disciples whose Christianity was based on the Saviour alone ! We might exclaim, “ Unhappy Paul, thou hadst no Luther nor Calvin nor Wesley to glory in, or whose name thou couldst bear in addition to that of Christ ! ” But were such the feelings of Paul ? He might himself have been a Luther, a Calvin, a Wesley, his name the watchword of a sect ; but the noble-minded Paul would glory only in Christ. He would not allow the adoption of any sectarian name in the church. Sectarian names and party divisions he denounced as carnal. “ Therefore ” (said he) “ let no man glory in men ; for they are all yours (they are all the property of the whole church), whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas,” (and we may add Luther and Calvin and Wesley) : all are yours, and ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s. So then (*οὐτως*) let a man consider us (me and Apollos, etc.) as ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God (but not as leaders of parties).”‡ He would

* Luther's Deutsche Werke, B. 14. S. 422.

† Ibid. S. 490.

‡ 1 Cor. 3: 21—4: 1.

have all believers called Christians and only Christians. All that this name implied he wished to be, and neither more nor less. Happy day ! when this spirit shall return to the church ! Then she may celebrate a jubilee, a glorious jubilee ; and it will literally be not a centennial, but a millennial jubilee. The last thousand years will have witnessed but one ! !

Nor would we pass in silence a collateral evil, resulting from the almost exclusive cultivation of sectarian literature. As this literature is all of a date subsequent to the Reformation, its perusal impresses the Protestant laity with the modern origin of our churches ; and leaves them in almost total darkness as to our real identity with the church of the earlier ages. Hence our people are unduly impressed by the Romish claim to superior antiquity, and an advantage is conceded to papists of which they cunningly avail themselves. If Protestants selected their literature promiscuously from among the different sects according to the intrinsic merits of the writers, it would tend much to promote actual unity and mutual esteem among themselves ; and if, both in their literature and creeds, they gave greater prominence to their identity with the primitive church, they would make the laity feel their connexion with the christians of the earlier centuries, and thus nullify the most popular argument by which papists proselyte Protestant members.

6. Another source of sectarian discord, is *ecclesiastical pride*. As long as man is sanctified but in part, this element of native depravity will more or less influence the disciples of Christ ; will seek and often find fuel even in the sanctuary of God. Each sect is naturally disposed to regard its institutions and its ministers as the most learned and able, or its members as most genteel, or its rites most fashionable, its churches most splendid, or its members the most pious, its path as far the best road to heaven. Ministers are tempted to be influenced by the fact, that they regard *their* churches as presenting the most conspicuous theatre for the display of their talents, or holding out the fairest prospects of advancement ; their audiences as the most intelligent, their support as the most liberal, or as best secured against contingencies. Hence they are in danger of looking on their less favored neighbors with secret disrespect ; of cherishing ecclesiastical pride, and having their judgment warped by it. We do not assert that all ministers or laymen yield to the influence of this temptation, yet happy is that man, who, on an impartial examination of his feelings as in the pre-

sence of God, stands fully acquitted by his own conscience ! That caution here is not superfluous, was evidently the opinion of the great apostle of the gentiles, who having himself repelled all sectarian honors, gives double force to his admonition : "These things, brethren, I have figuratively transferred (applied) to myself and to Apollos, for your sakes, that ye might learn by us not to esteem ministers (see v. 1.) above what is written (in v. 1. and ch. 3: 5—9, 21.) that no one of you may, on account of one (minister), be puffed up against another !"

7. The last source of sectarian discord to be noticed is *conflict of pecuniary interest* between neighbouring ministers and churches. This principle applies to the feelings of the minister in regard to his salary, which depends in some measure on the increase of his church. In reference to laymen, it applies to their raising funds for all ecclesiastical purposes. The more their church prospers and receives additions, the more will their pecuniary liabilities be divided, the more easily will the burden rest on their shoulders. Hence both pastors and people are tempted to envy and jealousy towards their christian neighbors of other denominations, because the success of either party, is more or less at the expense of the other. The success of either, diminishes the amount of materials for the others to act on, and this is a matter of serious moment to the parties especially in smaller towns and villages, where often twice as many ministers are stationed as are needed, or can be supported.

From this difficulty the primitive church was almost entirely exempt. In the earlier ages it was customary to appoint, that is, ordain several elders, or as we now term them ministers, in every church, who divided the labor between them, and generally continued to prosecute their secular business, thus in a great measure supporting themselves ; whilst it was customary from the beginning to provide for those who went abroad as *missionaries*, and travelled from place to place.* The only fund of the church, was that which arose from the voluntary offerings of the members on each Lord's day. This fund however was considerable ; and it was probably as a stimulus to liberality, that the custom of reading off the names of the contributors was introduced ; though its professed design was to commend them to the special prayers of the church.† In the third cen-

* Fuch's *Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen*, Vol. I. p. 72, 73.

† Ibid. Vol. I. p. 72.

tury, when the duties of ministers had become so greatly multiplied as to require their entire time, they were in some countries prohibited from following any secular profession, as we learn from Cyprian,* and other sources. The sixth of the *Apostolic Canons* reads thus :

Canon 6. *Neither a bishop, presbyter nor deacon shall engage in secular employment, on pain of being deposed from office.*

And the fortieth canon is as follows :

Canon 40. *We ordain that the bishop shall have the control of the congregational property. For as the precious souls of men are committed to his care, much more ought he to have the control of the church property, that he may freely arrange every thing, that he may aid the poor through the instrumentality of the presbyters and deacons, in the fear of God and in all honesty. He shall also be permitted to apply a portion of it to his own indispensable wants, if he needs it, as also for strange Christians who have come as guests ; and in these cases it is not necessary to suffer any want (μεταλαμβάνειν δε και αυτον των δεοντων, ειγε δεειτο, εις τας αναγκαιας αυτω χρειας και των επιξενουμενων αδελφων, ως κατα μηδενα τροπον αυτους υστερεισθαι).*

The fifty-eighth canon likewise relates to this subject :

Canon 58. *If a bishop refuses to supply the indispensable wants of a poor minister (namely from the church funds) he shall be set aside ; and if he still refuses to do it, let him be deposed as a murderer of his brethren.†*

At the Synod of Elvira, (in Spain, near the site of the present Granada,) the date of which is not entirely certain, though fixed with probability about the year 313, a restriction was imposed on ministers, by the eighteenth canon, which however presupposes that in Spain the secular business of ministers was not yet entirely prohibited.

Canon 18. *Bishops, elders and deacons shall not leave their place of residence for the sake of trade, nor traverse the provinces for the purposes of attending profitable fairs. They may, for the purpose of gaining a subsistence, send a son, or*

* Cypriani ep. 66. to the church at Furnae. Neander, sup. cit. p. 305.

† Roessler's Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Vol. 4. p. 232, 242, 243.

*or freedman, or hireling, or friend; or any one else; and if they wish to pursue any secular business, let it be within their province.**

In accordance with these original documents, is the opinion of Dr. Neander, who is confessedly the most learned writer of the present age, on the ancient history of the church. "It is almost certain (says he) that in the beginning, those who held offices in the church, continued to pursue their secular business, and thereby supported their families, as they had previously done. The congregations, which consisted chiefly of the poor, were scarcely able to provide for the support of their ministers (presbyters) and deacons, especially as at that time many other demands were made on the congregational treasury, such as for the support of the destitute widows, of the poor, of the sick, and of orphans. And it may be that the ministers often belonged to the wealthiest members of the church, and indeed this must often have been the case, as their office required a degree of previous cultivation of mind and manners, which could more frequently be found among persons in the higher or middle walks of life, than among the lower classes of society. If it was necessary that the presbyters or bishops, as they were in all respects to be an example to the flock, should also have been distinguished among the Christians for their hospitality (1 Tim. 3: 2), they must have belonged to those in easy circumstances, of whom the number was not large,—and how could such persons have permitted themselves to be supported by the savings of their more needy brethren! The apostle Paul does indeed declare, that the missionaries who went abroad to publish the gospel, are entitled to a support from those for whose spiritual benefit they labor, but we cannot hence infer the same in regard to the officers of individual congregations. The former could not well unite their secular profession with the duties of their spiritual calling, although to the self-denial of Paul even this was possible. But the latter could at first easily combine their secular profession with their ecclesiastical office. Nor was there any thing offensive in such a union ac-

* Ibid. Vol. 4. p. 280, 281. *Episcopi, Presbyteri et Diacones de locis suis negotiandi causa non discedant; nec circumeuntes provincias quaestuosas nundinas sectentur. Sane ad victum sibi conquirendum aut filium, aut libertum, aut mercenarium, aut amicum, aut quemlibet mittant, et si voluerint negotiari, intra provinciam negotientur.*

according to the primitive views of the Christians ; for they were convinced, that every earthly calling also could be sanctified by the christian design for which it is pursued, and they knew that even an apostle followed a secular business whilst engaged in publishing the gospel. But when the congregations became larger, and the duties of the church officers more numerous, when the duty of teaching was chiefly confined to the ministers, as the office of the ministers required all their time and exertions if they would perform them faithfully ; it was often no longer possible for them to provide for their own support, and the congregations having become larger, contained more wealth, and were now able to support them. The salary of the ministers was paid out of the congregational treasury, which was supplied by a voluntary contribution from each member at the meeting for public worship on every Lord's day, or as in Northern Africa, on the first Sunday of each month. Ministers were now urged to abstain from worldly business ; and in the third century they were absolutely prohibited from all such employment, even from the duties of a guardian. This regulation was doubtless founded on a very good reason, and was intended for the very salutary purpose of preventing the clergy from forgetting their sacred calling amid their worldly engagements ; for we see from the work of Cyprian, *de lapsis*, that during the long continued peace, a worldly spirit had already crept in among the bishops, and that, immersed in secular business, they neglected their spiritual duties and the welfare of their churches."*

Such then are the undoubted facts in the case. In the beginning there was not, there could not be any conflict of pecuniary interest between adjoining ministers and congregations. But it is evident, that even after it became necessary for ministers to relinquish their secular business and be supported by their congregations which they had a clear right to demand as soon as the congregations were large enough to support them, as Paul distinctly teaches in 1 Cor. ix. scarcely any more difficulty could arise ; because, there being but one denomination of Christians, there could not be several conflicting churches aiming to occupy the same ground, and the cases would be rare in which more ministers would be stationed in one place, than the population required and could support.

* Neander's Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche, Vol. I. p. 303, 304, 305.

How great the difficulties are, which now arise from this source is well known. Yet they might be greatly diminished by the plan of union hereafter proposed, if, a) the confederated denominations would resolve not to send into any neighborhood more ministers than would constitute a reasonable supply, say one to every thousand souls. b) Let all the members of the confederated churches, resident in such bounds unite in supporting one and the same minister. And c) if the whole confederated population of such a district is unable to furnish an adequate support for a minister, let application be made to the Home Missionary Society for aid. Thus would many laborers be spared for destitute portions of our land and of our globe, brotherly love would more abound in the church at home, and unity of spirit be greatly promoted.

Remedy for these evils, or plan for the restoration of Catholic Union on Apostolic Principles.

Any plan of union, in order to possess a claim to the attention of the different christian denominations generally, must be based on apostolic principles, must be accordant with the spirit and principles of the New Testament, or deducible from them. It must leave untouched the unalienable rights and obligations of Christians, and therefore must possess the following attributes :

1. It must require of no one the renunciation of any doctrine or opinion believed by him to be scriptural or true.

2. It must concede to each denomination or branch of the church of Christ, the right to retain its own organization, or to alter or amend it at option, leaving every thing relative to government, discipline, and worship, to be managed by each denomination according to its own views for the time being. The principle of ecclesiastical associations is scriptural ; the mode of its application and the extent of its use, are not decided by the sacred volume, and therefore are just matter for private judgment and progressive experience.

3. It must dissuade no one from discussing fundamentals and non-fundamentals in the spirit of christian love, and amicably showing why he believes some non-fundamental opinions held by any of his brethren to be incorrect.—Controversies might even exist among the confederated brethren, under the influence of scriptural

union ; but they would be divested of most of their bitterness, because the points at issue would confessedly be *non-fundamental*, having little or no perceptible influence on christian practice, involving no pecuniary loss by ejection from a pastoral relation, and menacing no ecclesiastical disabilities.

4. The plan must be applicable to all the orthodox christian denominations, to all that are regarded as portions of Christ's visible church on earth. It must embrace all whom the apostles and primitive Christians would have admitted to the one catholic or universal church ; all whom God has owned by the influence of his Spirit and grace. Upon this ground James, Peter, and John admitted Paul who had formerly been a persecutor of the brethren, and "gave to him the right hand of fellowship."* The Saviour never enjoined on men the duty of fixing the terms of communion in his church. This he has himself done in his word by precept and by the apostolic example ; and we are treading on forbidden ground when we separate those whom God by his grace and Spirit hath joined together. This is indeed not the design of the different denominations, but is it not too true, that it is virtually the result of the present state of sectarian division ?

Having now considered the character of primitive unity, and the causes of discord in the different branches of the Protestant church ; let us take our stand on the high ground of apostolic principles, and from that elevated post survey the divided heritage of the Saviour, and inquire how may the spirit, and, as far as possible, the form of primitive unity be restored ? And may that blessed Saviour, who promised wisdom from above to them that ask it, to lead them into all necessary truth, grant us the tuition of his Spirit to guide and bless this humble effort for the accomplishment of his own fervent prayer in behalf of his disciples : "That they all may be one ; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee."

I. Some few advocates of union have proposed, that all others should abandon their systems and peculiarities, and unite with them by conforming in all things to their views and practice.

As this method violates the unalienable rights and obligations

* Gal. 2: 9: When James, Cephas and John, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship.

of Christians, by requiring the abandonment of what they believe truth, and the practice of what they consider error, it cannot be regarded as judicious, or as promising any success. It would, moreover, betray extreme weakness for any one christian sect at this late day, to calculate on the universal adoption of its peculiarities by all others. Better, far better will it be, that all endeavor to forget sectarian differences, and coöperate for the publication of the Gospel to the 600,000,000 of perishing heathen, with a degree of ardor and cordiality, which will make us wear the appearance of one church.

II. It has been proposed, that each denomination should renounce its standards of doctrine and government and worship, and then all unite in one new, short confession, embracing only those doctrines held in common by all, and establishing such a system of government, as all could conscientiously adopt; whilst entire liberty and privilege of diversity should be enjoyed by all on every point not determined by the new standards.

This plan is liberal in its principles, violates none of the unalienable rights and obligations of Christians, and therefore possesses claims of the highest order. It lacks but one attribute of a proper union for Christians, on an apostolic basis. The apostles and primitive churches maintained unity with all whom they acknowledged as Christians; but this plan, we fear, is not applicable to all orthodox christian denominations. It would promise a union of the Lutherans, the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, the German Reformed, the Dutch Reformed, the Baptists, and, in short, of all those orthodox denominations, which hold parity of ministers. The Moravians, or United Brethren also could unite so far as doctrine is concerned, for as they adopt and have always held the Augsburg Confession, there would be no difficulty. The same is true so far as doctrine is concerned, of the Episcopal church, the Methodist and all other churches which practise diocesan episcopacy in our land. But the writer is unable to perceive how these denominations could all unite on any middle ground of church government. We must either have diocesan bishops or practise ministerial parity; and any plan, constructed on the principle of uniformity, must adopt either the one or the other, and could not enjoin both. But these churches are as orthodox and pious as any others, and God has as distinctly owned them as his own; so that we should feel criminal in virtually pronouncing that un-

clean which God has sanctified, were we to advocate a plan of union, which would exclude either the friends of ministerial parity or imparity. But if this plan were even feasible, its adoption would probably not result in much good ; as it would collect into one body for religious worship, those whose modes and habits of worship are so materially diverse as to justify the anticipation of but little harmony or edification.

III. Our own plan, which appears to us more accordant with the requisite attributes of a plan for christian union on apostolic principles, more feasible, and more safe, is embraced in the following features :

FIRST FEATURE. *The several christian denominations shall retain each its own present ecclesiastical organization, government, discipline, and mode of worship.* It is conceded by the great body of Christians, that the Scriptures do not determine all the particulars of any system of church government, but leave the matter, excepting some important outlines, to the conscientious judgment and experience of the church in every age, and under every form of civil government ; and the few who think they find their entire system of government in Scripture, do not regard it as so essential as to lead them to deny the christian character of others. Hence every church has an equal right deliberately to test her forms of ecclesiastical organization by experience ; and diversity of practice on this point, ought neither to preclude ecclesiastical communion, nor impede substantial union among the parties. This principle is distinctly avowed in the mother symbol of Protestantism, the Augsburg Confession : " For the true unity of the church (say the confessors) nothing more is required than agreement concerning the doctrines of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary, that the same human traditions, that is, rites and ceremonies instituted by men, should be everywhere observed." * It is indeed true, that whilst many churches have no connection whatever with each other even though contiguous ; others are united together more closely than any of the apostolic churches were. But the questions whether and when they shall relax these sectarian bonds, should be left to their own decision. The evils of too close a union in extended bodies are beginning to be extensively felt ; and if through the influence of the impartial investigation, fostered by the kind of union

* Augsburg Confession, Art. VII.

proposed in this Appeal, some churches should relinquish any features of their ecclesiastical organization, as is entirely possible; they have full liberty to reform themselves, and, under the progressive light of God's providence, gradually, to assume towards each other and towards the great body of the Protestant church, whatever relation and organization appear to them best adapted to the millennial age. But the attempt, to unite all the churches in our land under the control of one judicatory of supervision, jurisdiction, and appeal, appears to the writer neither desirable nor safe. It would be a distinct approximation to a new hierarchy. Very extensive courts are too cumbersome for efficient action, business is retarded, power tends to accumulation, the rights of conscience are in danger of being infringed either by statute, or by an accumulated moral influence which crushes all that refuses to submit to its dictation.

Moreover, so long as men entertain materially different views of government and modes of worship, it cannot be conducive to harmony or edification, to press them to unite on any one form. The attempt to promote union by the immediate abandonment of existing organizations, would seem to be inexpedient also for another reason. Experience proves it dangerous suddenly to unsettle the long established habits of the community; lest being released from the old, they fail generally to settle down with firmness on any thing new that is better. But the first feature of our plan, by stipulating that each denomination shall retain its organization as long as it shall see fit, provides against this danger, and leaves each denomination as an independent community to watch the effects of the other features hereafter proposed, and decide for itself how far to accede to the terms of union, and how long to adhere to them. It also provides for the indulgence of existing diversities and preferences so long as they shall continue; whilst the other features will gradually tend to diminish them; thus inviting external uniformity no faster than unity of spirit and of views has fully prepared the way. And, finally, this feature would leave untouched the relations, government and charters of the various religious, theological and benevolent institutions, whilst the general plan of union would promote unity of spirit and efficient coöperation among them all, for accelerating the grand enterprise of the christian church, to preach the gospel to every rational creature.

SECOND FEATURE. *Let each of the confederated denominations formally resolve for itself, not to discipline any member or*

minister, for holding a doctrine believed by any other denomination whose christian character they acknowledge, provided his deportment be unexceptionable, and he conform to the rules of government, discipline and worship adopted by said denomination. This would be actually retaining in good standing all, whom the apostles would have retained. And yet, such is the influence of habit and long familiarity with sectarian organizations, that to some this feature of our plan will appear altogether impracticable. But if it is so in any portion of the church, it must be from want of christian charity, of that grace enjoined by the apostle, "not to judge a brother," (Romans xiv.), from indisposition or inability to obey the apostolic precept, to receive those who are weak in the faith, *but not to doubtful disputation*. If then it be only our want of charity which disqualifies us for the adoption of this feature of union, let us not assail it; but set about reforming ourselves, and enlarging our hearts, until they cordially respond to the injunction of the great apostle of the Gentiles, to receive those who are weak (in our judgment, defective,) in the faith. It is true, the apostle Peter denounced some as false teachers, and Paul commanded the excommunication of others; but what were the crimes or heresies of which these persons were convicted? If they were such as all the orthodox churches would unite in regarding an ample ground of excommunication, and if in no instance the apostles enjoined discipline, for a point which any orthodox denomination would regard as insufficient, then the apostolic example affords full sanction for our plan, because this is exactly the ground which it assumes, and by its provisions all would be excluded whom the apostles would reject; and is not that enough? As to false doctrine, we find Peter denouncing those as *false* teachers who "bring in damnable heresies (*αἵρεσις ἀπωλείας*, destructive heresies or divisions), *denying even the Lord that bought them.*"¹ And, it is scarcely necessary to say, that such errorists would unhesitatingly be excluded by the terms of the proposed union, as they also were from the churches of the earlier centuries by the apostles' creed. Peter denounced Simon Magus as "having neither part nor lot in this matter," but it was for attempting to bribe the apostles and *believing* that the miraculous gifts of God could be purchased with money.² The apostle Paul wishes the Galatians to cut

¹ 2 Pet. 2: 1.

² Acts 8: 9, 10.

off certain persons,¹ but they were guilty of having denied the doctrine of salvation by grace on account of the merits of Christ. they made "Christ of no effect,"² maintaining (probably, not by inference of others) that men must be "justified by the law;"³ thus "preaching another gospel,"⁴ and denying a fundamental doctrine, held by all the orthodox denominations, that salvation is by grace, through the merits of Christ. And in his first epistle to Timothy, the same apostle predicts, that "in after-times some shall *depart*, (or rather, apostatize ἀποστήσονται) from the faith. And what was it in them which he denounced as *apostasy* from the faith? He himself informs us, that it was giving heed to seducing spirits," and believing the doctrines concerning (not devils, but δαίμονων demons, or) inferior deities such as worshipped heroes or saints, speaking lies in hypocrisy, "having their conscience seared," "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats." Here again it will be conceded, that any church deserving the name of orthodox, would not hesitate to exclude any one who should be chargeable with the counts summed up by the apostle, and so mournfully applicable to the Romish church. And, finally, the beloved apostle John warns his readers against some false teachers, whom he styles anti-christs. But what does he represent them as teaching? "Who is the liar, but he who *denieth that Jesus is the Christ* (the Messiah promised in the Old Testament)? He is the anti-christ, that denieth *the Father and the Son*."⁵ And "many deceivers are entered into the world, who do not confess that *Jesus Christ came into the world*, this is a deceiver and an anti-christ."⁶ Now these, if we mistake not, are all the instances in which the apostles either expressly enjoined excommunication for error in doctrine, or denounced the errorists in language implying, that they ought to be regarded, not as erring brethren, but as apostates from Christianity; and, as not one of these errors is held by any of the so-called orthodox churches, as every one of them is denounced by them, the plan we propose would reach them all, and thus the rigor of discipline be quite as great as the apostles enjoined.

In addition to these errors in doctrine, the apostle has enumerated a list of practical abuses, as proper causes of ecclesiastical discipline, lest a little leaven of sin should corrupt the

¹ Gal. 5: 12.² 5: 4.³ 5: 4.⁴ 1: 6, 8, 9.⁵ 1 John 2: 22.⁶ 2 John v. 7.

whole church, namely incest,¹ fornication, dishonesty in the pursuit of wealth, idolatry, railing, drunkenness and extortion. To this class also belong the apostle's injunction: "A man that is a schismatic (*αἰρετικός*, a maker of divisions or sects or parties in the church),² after the first and second admonition reject," and that of the Saviour to exclude one who will not hear the church. Yet as these are not doctrinal aberrations, they are not affected by the plan of union, since its first feature provides that each denomination shall retain its rules of government, discipline and worship.

And is there no passage in Scripture justifying discipline for doctrinal errors of a minor grade? The apostle does indeed command us "earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." Yet, as he does not specify how we ought to contend, whether by preaching, or writing, or ecclesiastical discipline, it is uncertain whether discipline was meant. And admitting that he also intended discipline, it seems reasonable, that it should be employed only in defence of those doctrines which were certainly delivered to the saints; and he could not have meant that some saints should turn their brethren out of the church, for holding sentiments which others whom they acknowledged to be saints, and who remained in the church, believed to be a part of the gospel of Christ. If excommunication were one of the appointed means for *ascertaining* the truth, it might with propriety be applied in doubtful cases. But the New Testament represents it as a penalty, to be inflicted on those who have so criminally and materially forsaken the path of truth or of virtue, as to be unworthy of the christian name. Hence it ought not to be applied in reference to points on which Christians of equal piety, talent, and grace, are in debate, whether they belong to the gospel of Christ or not.

That we are not allowed in regard to matters disputed among Christians, to act as if we were certainly right, is evident from the express injunctions of the apostles to the contrary. We are

¹ 1 Cor. 5: 11.

² This version after much examination seems to the writer the true one. It is sustained by three-fourths of the best critics, such as Michaelis, Schleusner, Wahl, De Wette, Stoltz, Heumann, Van Ess, Seiler, etc. But should we even adopt the common version, the passage is inapplicable, as the context does not decide what errors the apostle considered heresies.

³ Matt. 18: 17.

commanded to "receive him that is weak in the faith (him who, in our judgment, is in error on some points) ; but not to doubtful disputations (not for the purpose of disputing about his scruples, or deciding on them).¹ Again, "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." Again, "Why dost thou judge (condemn) thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ."² Paul warns Timothy against "doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof come envy, strifes, railings, evil surmisings (unjust suspicions), perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds," etc.³ Again, "Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord, that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers." And again, "Follow charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart ; But foolish and (*ἀναίδειροις*) *untaught* questions (*which had not been decided by the apostles*) avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes."⁴

We are therefore commanded on the one hand to "cut off those antichrists who preach another gospel," and on the other, not to judge (pass sentence, or condemn) him whom, on the whole, we regard as a brother ; but to receive him and to avoid foolish and *untaught questions*, QUESTIONS NOT CLEARLY DECIDED IN SCRIPTURE. If we unite these two precepts into one, they will be equivalent, we think, to the general command to discipline men for denying what is certainly an essential part of the gospel of Christ, but not for any doctrine about which acknowledged Christians differ, and which is therefore doubtful. For we suppose the following rule will be found a fair, safe and tangible one : *That all those doctrines which the great body of all Christians whom God has owned by his grace and Spirit, and who have free access to the Scriptures, agree in finding in them, are certainly taught there ; and all those points on which they differ are less certain, are doubtful.* This rule is based on the dictates of common sense, that if the Scriptures are a revelation from God to man, they must on all points necessary to salvation, be intelligible to all impartial and competent inquirers ; and that true Christians, who are engaged in daily efforts to serve God, and who bear in their hearts and exhibit in their lives, the evidences of God's grace and Spirit, are the most sin-

¹ Rom. 14: 1.² 14: 5—10.³ 1 Tim. 6: 4.⁴ 2 Tim. 2: 14, 23.

cere, impartial and competent inquirers into his word. Now we suppose, that the great mass of true Christians in our land will be comprehended not in any one sect, but in the aggregate of all the orthodox protestant denominations.

Again, the judgment of each denomination, as to the most important points of doctrine taught in the Scriptures is confessedly set forth by the creed which it professes. Hence those doctrines which are taught in common by the creeds of all the so-called orthodox Protestant denominations, and as far as thus unitedly taught, may be safely regarded as clearly revealed in the book of God. We limit the rule to *Protestant* denominations, because in the papal sect, the mass of the people have not access to the word of God, and believe the doctrines of their creed simply because their church teaches them. It is limited to *orthodox* denominations, because there are unhappily some in our land professing to receive the Scriptures, but in reality rejecting their divine inspiration, and, as we are constrained to believe, denying the Lord that bought them, and preaching another Christ. Let it not be supposed, that this rule resembles that of the Romanists, who explain the Scriptures according to the pretended unanimous consent of the fathers; for those fathers instead of constituting the great mass or majority of believers in any age, were not one in a million. Nor could the mass of believers in any age fall under our rule, unless they had free and uncontrolled access to the Scriptures, either in the original, if its languages were vernacular to them, or in a faithful version. It could therefore apply only to the Protestant churches, and to the churches of the first few centuries before ecclesiastical enactments interfered with the free unbiassed use of the Scriptures. And concerning the opinions of the mass of believers in the earlier centuries, we know next to nothing, except that they received the so-called Apostles' creed.

We are thus conducted, by Scripture and reason, to the adoption of the *second feature* of the proposed catholic union, namely, *not to discipline a brother, whose deportment is unexceptionable, and who conforms to our existing regulations of government, discipline and worship, for holding a doctrine believed by any acknowledged orthodox denomination.* This practice, so far as the Scriptures enable us to judge, accords with that of the apostolic churches; it certainly agrees with the practice of the church in the first four centuries after the apostles, for they disciplined only for the denial of a doctrine taught

in the Apostles', and afterwards in the Nicene creed, all of which are received by every orthodox denomination. Not one of the distinguishing points on which Protestants differ, is determined in either the Apostles' or the Nicene creed, and therefore it is indisputable, that any one of these denominations would have been received and retained (not disciplined) by all other portions of the so-called universal (catholic) church.

And why ought not the different branches of the Protestant church to adopt this rule? That persons differing on these disputed doctrinal points, but agreeing in their views of church government, discipline and mode of worship, can live harmoniously in the same church, and coöperate cordially in the duties and privileges of church members, is not a matter of mere speculative conjecture. It is a notorious fact that in every denomination there are not a few among the pious laity, living and cordially coöperating in the same church, who differ from each other, as much as the creeds of the several denominations differ. The writer has personally known many instances of this kind in the Lutheran, Presbyterian and Episcopal churches, and has no doubt that cases equally frequent occur in the other denominations. If this can be done by pious laymen, there is no reason why pious ministers could not live together in the same unity of spirit, notwithstanding minor differences in doctrinal views; especially if they were taught in their theological course, themselves to regard as less important the several points which separate the orthodox churches, and in their public exercises to lay the more stress on the cardinal doctrines of the christian scheme. It is well known that in the Episcopal church ministers of different doctrinal views exist and labor in friendship. "Perhaps" (says the liberal and amiable author of 'Hints on Catholic Union,') "there is not a shade or variety of theological opinion, within the circle of evangelical truth, that has not had an advocate among the divines of the Church of England." In the Presbyterian church also a large number of ministers have believed in general atonement, whilst others, agreeably to their Confession, consider the atonement as limited. Yet these brethren have generally lived together and coöperated in peace until recently. At present, for reasons, into which our design does not urge us to inquire, these differing brethren in the Presbyterian church are engaged in warm disputations, whilst among

¹ See Hints on Catholic Union, by a Presbyterian of the Protestant Episcopal Church, p. 46. New York, 1836.

our Episcopal brethren, the same differences still exist and are regarded with christian charity. And why should a Presbyterian, who regards a dissentient Episcopalian or a Methodist as a brother, condemn the member of his own church or ministry, who holds similar views? Why should any man regard that as heresy in a Presbyterian, which in a Methodist or Episcopalian, is, according to his own judgment, consistent with christian character, and comports with a life of acknowledged piety and usefulness? The only conceivable difference is, that the one may be regarded as violating the obligation of his creed, whilst the others do not violate it. This is indeed highly important to the character of the individual. No man should teach a doctrine which he believes to be inconsistent with the creed of his church, if he pledged himself to uphold every individual doctrine contained in it, and if his promise was not, as some suppose it to be, a promise to receive the confession as teaching *the general system* of truth revealed in Scripture. If there be diversity of opinion as to the nature of the subscription to a creed, whether it binds to every individual doctrine, or only to the *system* of truths contained in it; *this point ought doubtless to be first settled.*¹ Whilst it remains under dispute, every attempt at discipline will be encumbered by a double issue. The friends of liberal construction will undertake to prove, that they have not abandoned the creed (meaning its general system of truth); whilst the advocates of rigid construction will prove that they have not adhered to eve-

¹ It has been asserted on the authority of early records that the principle of liberal construction was adopted near the origin of the Presbyterian church in this country, and was practised on, and the fact appears to be established by the testimony of President Davies recently published in the "American Quarterly Register" for May 1837, p. 316. In an extract from his diary, during a visit to England in behalf of Princeton College, under date March nineteenth, 1754, we find the following reply given by Mr. Davies to Mr. Prior, who inquired, whether the Presbyterians in America would admit any person to the ministry, without his subscribing the Westminster Confession: "I replied that we allowed the candidate to mention his objections against any article in the Confession, and the judicature judged whether the articles objected against, were essential to Christianity; and if they judged they were not, they would admit the candidate notwithstanding his objections. He (Mr. Prior) seemed to think that we were such rigid Calvinists that we would not admit an Arminian to communion."

ry individual doctrine, and will expatiate on the guilt of violating the obligation imposed by the confession.

Would it not be far better for both parties to inquire *whether they have a right from apostolic precept or example, to bind either themselves or others to more than the fundamental truths of christian doctrine, and to as many points of government, discipline and worship as are actually necessary to harmonious coöperation?* If the views of this Appeal be correct, then subscription to transfundamental doctrinal creeds is always wrong, and if wrong then it ceases to be binding so soon as its impropriety is seen, and ought to be retracted, whilst the creed should be reduced to fundamentals, or subscription be required only "to the fundamental doctrines of the Bible as contained in the creed." For, after the failure of extended creeds to produce unanimity, and after their tendency to cause strife and divide the body of Christ, have become as certain as any other matter of historical record; why should protestants continue to bind either themselves, or others to them? Especially, as such extended creeds were unheard of in the days of the apostles, and for hundreds of years after? If the same word of God which we now possess, when aided by the oral instruction and the personal example of the apostles, could not produce entire unanimity among the primitive Christians, how could it be expected to effect more at the present time? or, why should we require greater unanimity than the primitive Christians did, as a term of ecclesiastical communion?

• So long as there is the same diversity of talent, of mental temperament, of habits of education, and of supposed interest, such diversity will continue to exist. Nor ought it to be regarded as necessarily criminal, or as inconsistent with christian fellowship and fidelity. Difference on non-essentials has no perceptible influence on christian character and practice. There are differences in other departments of human knowledge, and some even connected with religion, of equal magnitude, such as the value of a death bed repentance, the mode of treating awakened sinners and of conducting revivals, etc., and yet, because these points are not settled in the creed, men agree to differ on them, their peace and harmonious coöperation are rarely disturbed for any length of time; for as Luther justly remarked, *alia est concordia fidei, alia charitatis*. Such variety of opinions on non-fundamentals moreover, may even exert a salutary tendency, may stimulate men to inquiry and peaceful discussion,

thus keeping alive a healthful spirit of investigation, and preventing the indifference, which some have apprehended, might result from the absence of extensive creeds.

Under the operation of this feature of union, full liberty of investigation would be allowed within the bounds of fundamentals, without the danger of exclusion from house and home, or pastoral charge. And, is it not reasonable to suspect that that system which cannot trust itself to the full and unbiassed influence of God's word without the artificial aid of creeds, and those peculiarities which need to be instilled into the youthful mind more explicitly than the Bible teaches them, lest they be lost, are erroneous, are not worth keeping; and that permitting them to become obsolete, would only advance the unity of the church? Every disciple of Christ ought to be willing to see the peculiarities of his own denomination cast into the crucible of God's word, and exposed to the unrestrained action of Bible truth and Bible principles, in order that the truth of God might thus be gradually developed in its full purity over the whole church, the breaches in Zion's walls be healed, and one peculiar people zealous of good works, be raised up to God. The writer takes pleasure in being able to cite in support of his position the opinion of that distinguished servant of God, Calvin, whose zeal against *fundamental* errorists will not be disputed, but whose magnanimous liberality in reference to all but fundamentals, appears to be but little known and still less appreciated. He even goes much further than our plan of union proposes, and dissuades from schism, if a church neglect to discipline for the grossest immoralities; whilst our plan proposes, that in regard to government, discipline and mode of worship, each one shall, as heretofore, connect himself with that branch of the church, whose forms he believes best calculated to advance the kingdom of the Redeemer. His language, in a letter to Farrel, is this: "*I only contended for this, that they should not create schism in any church, which, although very corrupt in morals, and infected with strange doctrines, had not entirely departed from that doctrine, on which Paul informs us the church of Christ is founded.*"¹ And it was in

¹ Hoc unum contendebar, ne schismate scinderent qualemcumque ecclesiam: quæ, utcumque esset corruptissima moribus, doctrinis etiam exoticis infecta, non tamen desciverit penitus ab ea doctrina qua ecclesiam Christi fundari docet Paulus. Calv. Epist. Opp. § IX. p. 6.

the same spirit of liberality that, as he himself informs us, he subscribed the Augsburg or Lutheran Confession of faith, and declares the points of difference between the Protestant churches of his day, an insufficient cause for division.¹

THIRD FEATURE. *Let a creed be adopted including only the doctrines held in common by all the orthodox christian denominations, to be termed the Apostolic, Protestant Confession, and let this same creed be used by all denominations as the term of sacramental, ecclesiastical and ministerial communion.* To this each denomination would add its present Formularies for government, discipline and mode of worship, which it might also change or amend from time to time, at its own option, and in its own way. Each denomination might also use its former creed as a book of instruction to whatever extent it saw proper.

The new creed should consist of two parts, a) The so-called *Apostles' Creed*.² This little formulary has already been adopted by four fifths of the Protestant church, by the Lutherans in the different kingdoms of Europe, by the Episcopalians in Europe and America, and by the Presbyterian church in this country and probably also in Great Britain. The doctrines contained in it are embraced by every orthodox Protestant denomination on earth. The adoption of this confession would establish the doctrinal identity of the confederated churches, with that of the apostolic age, and of the first four centuries; which is a matter of no small moment in the popular mind, and has been too much neglected by Protestants. b) The second part should be styled *The United Protestant Confession*, consisting of a selection of those articles from the creeds of the prominent Protestant churches, in which *all* can agree, taking but one article on each subject. As each of these churches acknowledge the christian character of the others, they all virtually admit, that the creed of each church contains every thing essential on the doctrine which any given article treats; whilst each one believes the creed of the other to contain minor errors on some points. Now, *if a selection can be made from all the creeds, which will contain an article on every topic necessary to be introduced, and yet not include any peculiar aspects of doctrines on which the parties differ; all denominations can evidently adopt it; for they fully believe it, and have already acknowledged its*

¹ Epist. Schalingio, p. 113. Farello, p. 9. Mason's Plea, p. 182, 183.

² For a copy of this Creed, See page 121.

christian character by acknowledging as brethren those who profess it. And if in order to complete such a creed, it would be necessary to strike out some minor specifications from any article of the existing creeds, in order to make it unexceptionable to all parties, it is evident, that *if nothing be added*, all can still adopt it, because the thing erased must be non-essential, as it is one on which the confederated denominations differ.

It might be thought preferable by some, that a general council of the liberal-minded of all denominations should be called to deliberate and form an original creed, covering the common ground of the Protestant churches. But the testimony of experience is not strongly in favor of the probable results of such a convention. The whole field of theological topics would have to be passed over, and the discussions entered on anew which were passed through in the original formation of the several creeds. But by the far simpler plan here proposed, all these difficulties are obviated. We have in the creed of each denomination the result of its deliberations on all these points. Taking these as the separate voices of the different churches, we can by the principles above suggested, without difficulty frame one creed, in which these voices shall unitedly be heard proclaiming the common faith of all God's people. As the method proposed neither requires nor admits the composition of a single original sentence, it will not be thought presumptuous in the writer to attempt the application of his own rules. He has accordingly formed such a Protestant confession, and appended it to this Appeal.

These two parts would constitute the *Apostolic, Protestant Confession*, required by the third feature of the proposed union. The necessity and advantages of such a creed are evident.

1. *In order to keep heretics out of the church of God.* The duty of the church to exclude from her communion all who deny a fundamental doctrine, is admitted by all whose union is contemplated in this plan. The apostle John expressly declares, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine," (concerning the person of Christ, his real and not merely feigned appearance in the flesh, as the gnostics asserted v. 7, and 1 John 4: 2) receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."¹ Now in order to bring men to the test,

¹ 2 John 10, 11.

whose fundamental soundness is suspected, it is absolutely necessary¹ to have a creed, either written or nuncupatory. But whilst the principle of both is the same, a written creed has many confessed advantages, and must necessarily constitute one feature of our catholic union. And having thus enlarged the ground of christian forbearance, and confined the test to the truths held in common by the orthodox churches, the utmost delicacy, and uncompromising spirit ought, and it is believed, could be displayed, in the discipline and the excommunication of any and every one, who denies a single doctrine actually taught (not by inference) in the common creed. One principal cause of laxity in executing discipline for doctrinal deviations from the different creeds, is undoubtedly the conviction, derived from Scripture and reason, that the errors impugned are so trifling to deserve discipline.

2. Such a creed is necessary, to give prominence to the great, acknowledged truths of Christianity.

a) It has been doubted whether it is possible to give special prominence to the grand doctrines of Christianity, without becoming incoherent, or illogical, or vapid; but its practicability has often been demonstrated by facts, and ought therefore not to be disputed. The writer many years ago, for some time attended the preaching in the college chapel at Princeton, where the professors of the Seminary and College alternately officiated, all of whom were Calvinists; yet he rarely heard a sentiment conflicting with Lutheranism, and very rarely heard the peculiarities of any sect introduced. The reason is, that those excellent men, feeling that there were in that college, students from all churches, were disposed to avoid unnecessary offence, and yet they dwelt on the whole circle of undisputed christian doctrine. None who heard them would wish more

¹ On this subject we would refer the reader to a "*Lecture on Creeds and Confessions*," by Rev. Dr. Miller of Princeton, containing many very sound arguments in favor of their indispensable necessity to the unity of the church. Whether the author would consent to the modifications of the subject proposed in this Appeal, and confine the doctrinal specifications of the creed to the common ground of Protestantism, we know not. Yet we are almost led to hope so from the fact that all the cases adduced by him, to show the necessity of including non-fundamental matters in it, are cases belonging to government, discipline or forms of worship, on which this plan proposes that the sectarian standards may be retained.

edifying, practical and profitable preaching. The volume of Sermons and Addresses by Dr. Green, published soon after he resigned the presidency of that institution, probably contains some of the sermons then delivered by him. Of that volume, a review was soon after published in the Christian Advocate, and the writer distinctly recollects that the reviewer applauded the unsectarian character of the discourses, and pronounced them free from every thing to which Christians of any religious denomination could with propriety object. The opinion of the reviewer is cited because the writer has not read the work, and therefore could not speak for himself. As indisputable specimens of most excellent religious discussion confined to the undisputed truths of Christianity, the common ground of the orthodox churches, we may cite the publications of the American Tract Society, and of the American Sunday School Union. We might cite the Sermons of president Davies, Doddridge's Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul, Burder's Village Sermons, and a number of other invaluable works as substantially confined to the grand, cardinal doctrines of Christianity. And is it not a notorious fact that these and other similar publications, are the works which have exerted the greatest influence in producing the evangelical spirit and enterprise of the present day? Has not the blessed Saviour so signally blessed these works, above all others of a sectarian character, as specially to encourage their multiplication, not indeed so as to exclude others, but to give greater prominence to these?

b) Prominence ought to be given to these undisputed doctrines, *because they alone are CERTAINLY TRUE*. It has been stated, that the aggregate of doctrines believed by the different orthodox denominations may be divided into two classes, those that are believed by them all, and those which are believed by some and disbelieved by others. As men of equal piety, talent and learning differ in respect to the latter, it is but just to suppose, that they are not *so clearly* revealed, and so definitely decided by Scripture, as those points which all agree in finding in that sacred book. And as they are not so clearly revealed, they cannot be essential to salvation, nor so certain in themselves, if our knowledge of them is derived from revelation alone.

Moreover, no one Protestant sect is more numerous than all the others together. The Lutheran church, which is by far the largest, numbers according to the best authorities, a population of about 30,000,000, whilst the whole body of Protestants

amounts to about 70,000,000. Hence, it is evident that the peculiar, distinguishing doctrine of each sect, is disbelieved by the majority of Protestants. If a disputed doctrine be common to several of the larger sects, it then has a majority of all Protestants in its favor, and the probability of its biblical authority is augmented. But those doctrines alone can be regarded as *certainly* scriptural, which the great mass of all enlightened, faithful, acknowledged Christians, who have free access to the Bible, agree in finding in it. These undisputed doctrines alone, we suppose, can be essential to salvation. For it is acknowledged by each sect, that persons denying its distinguishing tenets, do exhibit evidence of piety, and will be saved. Hence, uniting this judgment of all the sects, Protestants do themselves acknowledge, that persons will be saved in the denial of each of the disputed doctrines. Hence, none but the undisputed tenets are in fact judged by Protestants to be essential to salvation.

If these views be correct, all christian teachers should accustom themselves to distinguish in their own minds between the disputed and the undisputed doctrines of Christianity ; and in their instructions they ought to give special prominence to the latter. Who would think of adopting as text-book in a College, an author on Chemistry or Natural Philosophy, who introduced the various disputed opinions and theories of a particular class of men, which he regarded as true ; but did not distinguish between these opinions, and those facts and principles fully established and admitted by all ? Let us go one step further, and suppose the peculiarities referred to be such as are regarded as erroneous by the majority of chemists. Such a book would by common consent be considered unsafe, and be pronounced unphilosophical. Yet this is exactly the practice of all the different denominations. Their standards make no distinction between fundamental and nonfundamental doctrines, between those which are certain, and not disputed by any acknowledged christian denomination, and those which, though believed by some, are disputed and disbelieved by others. It would certainly be conducive to christian union and sound christian knowledge, if the distinction between disputed and undisputed doctrines were distinctly made by including the latter only in the public creed, leaving the former as subjects of amicable difference, and as occasions to exercise that forbearance required by the apostle, in "not judging our brother." For if

we introduce these minor, disputed points into our test, and then by virtue of it, drive out of our church all who in the least differ from us, where is there any room for exercising christian forbearance to a "brother who is weak in the faith." There will be none such left. We think the great apostle evidently contemplated a different practice in the church.

c) Prominence should be given to the undisputed truths of Christianity, because they are the principal means which effect the good accomplished by all the different sects, the principal means of conversion, sanctification and salvation. Those points of sectarian diversity which are true, (but which these are, no man can determine with *absolute* certainty,) are doubtless more or less connected with the more important truths, and have some influence; yet that their effect is comparatively very small, is manifest from the fact, that the Spirit's operations have been extended to all these several denominations. The errors of sects have not destroyed the blessing vouchsafed on the undisputed truths held by them, nor prevented them from being the vehicle of salvation to thousands. It is therefore not the peculiarities of the Lutherans, the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, the Episcopalians or Methodists, which do the good accomplished by these churches, but that amount of truth held in common by all. Hence this amount of common truth, ought always to be distinguished from the "doubtful disputations," and especially should be made prominent in the public exercises of the sanctuary.

d) Such a creed would serve as a *bond of union, between all true Christians over the whole world*. Doctrine is, in the judgment of mankind, far more important than modes of government. It is diversity of doctrine, even on minor points, which has been adopted as the pretext for the major part of the divisions and contentions among Christians. The adoption of the same creed of fundamentals by all, without any alteration, would give prominence to their actual agreement in essential doctrines, and thus operate as a bond of union among Christians. Those denominations whose standards approximate nearest in doctrine, do in reality cherish and exhibit more fellow feeling than others who agree in form of government, but differ materially in doctrine. This is exemplified in the intimate union and coöperation which have for a long time existed between the Congregational, the Presbyterian, and the Low-Dutch churches of our land. Yet there have always been in

these coöperating and affiliated churches, many persons who differed from each other, fully as much as the creeds of any two orthodox churches do. The contentions in the church about doctrine arise not so much from the existence of some diversity on nonfundamentals, as from the fact, that the majority of existing creeds hold up this minor diversity to constant view, and by ranking the minor and disputed points among the doctrines which are the test of ecclesiastical communion, they perpetuate dissension by conveying and cherishing the impression, that these points are of vital moment. A fundamental creed would exert directly the reverse influence, and give prominence to those doctrines which are *certainly* true, and are not disputed by any acknowledged christian sect; whilst it would imply the minor importance of the disputed points, and teach men to exercise charity in regard to them. This was the character of the Apostles' creed and the Nicene creed, which were the only creeds used in the first three centuries of the church as tests; and their influence as a bond of union among Christians was confessedly very great. Now it is a notorious fact, that all the Protestant churches believe every sentence in these creeds, and can subscribe them without renouncing a single opinion. So far as the sacred records inform us, the apostles themselves did not require half as much as is contained in these creeds. The doctrine on which they laid most stress, is "that Jesus is the Son of God." Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God." Whosoever confesseth that Jesus Christ is the son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God." Paul to the Romans¹ expressly says: "This is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

Concord in fundamentals is the only doctrinal unity which existed among primitive Christians, and which is necessary. And in all probability, much greater unity in doctrine never will exist in the church on earth, unless God miraculously produces more. But there will be a much greater degree of charity and forbearance, and consequent unity of spirit, in the days of millennial glory, and the freedom of investigation and practice that are advocated in this appeal and would be secured by the plan of union proposed, will, it is believed, powerfully tend not only to produce that unity of spirit, but also to bring about some

¹ Romans 10: 8.

greater unity in nonfundamental points, and perhaps in the forms of government and worship. When Christians shall have full liberty to change their opinions on minor topics, without the fear of prosecution, or the apprehension of popular or ecclesiastical odium as the primitive Christians had, it seems natural to expect, that they will form their opinions more exclusively on the naked evidences of the truth itself. But at present, the avowal of a change of opinion on some points of sectarian diversity, is in some Protestant churches connected with such formidable inconveniences, such as prosecution for heresy, removal from pastoral charge, odium of the brethren etc., that when a man, and especially a minister, has once connected himself with any denomination, he finds it very difficult to engage in the investigation of these minor points of his own or other denominations free from extraneous bias. It may be said, that good men ought to rise above these influences, and be unbiassed by such consequences; but it is far easier to inculcate, than practise this good advice.

e) *Such a creed might also be regarded as a standing testimony of the church in behalf of the truth, and against error.* Let it not be said, that it would contain any thing which a portion of Christians regard as error; for it is to embrace only those doctrines which all the so-called orthodox agree in finding in Scripture. Nor can it in justice be objected, that it would not be explicit or ample enough; it would be far more explicit and five times as ample as the testimony which the church of Christ during the first four centuries ever bore in this way. Nor do we suppose, that any satisfactory reason can be adduced to show, that it is the duty of one part of the church to bear testimony against those opinions of the truth of which, another part are "fully persuaded in their own minds" and thus to "judge one another," (Rom. 14: 1—8.) or that any good has ever resulted from such testimony.

FOURTH FEATURE. *There should be free sacramental, ecclesiastical and ministerial communion, among the confederated churches.*

The first of these elements, namely free *sacramental* communion, may be said already to exist among the churches. For by it is not intended, that the members of any branch of the Protestant church should forsake the sacramental ordinance of the house in which they statedly worship. This could be productive only of confusion, and eventually would create discord

instead of union. And, the writer supposes, that throughout the whole of this plan there is nothing which ought to create disturbance or unsettle the affairs of individual congregations of Christians. But when members of one church are present at a sacramental celebration in another, a public invitation to members of sister churches in good standing, ought always to be given, as it happily is in most churches, and ought to be, as it now generally is, accepted. On this topic, the practice of the churches already coincides with our plan, and no alteration would be desired, excepting that the few churches which have not yet given this public invitation, should also adopt the practice of their brethren.

By *ecclesiastical* communion, we mean that a certificate of good standing in any one church should be a certain passport for admission to regular membership in any other. This element also may be said already to exist in the different branches of the church. Yet its real import is not always understood, nor its legitimate consequences followed out in practice. Christians should regard themselves as members of the church universal as well as of any particular denomination. Hence, when removing to other places, although they naturally and properly connect themselves with their own denomination if there be a church of the kind in the place; yet if there be not, they ought to connect themselves with any other christian church which comes nearest to their views of truth and duty, and in which they could receive and communicate the greatest amount of good. How melancholy is it that persons, professing to be Christians, living in villages and neighborhoods where there is not and cannot be a church of their denomination, remain ten or twenty years, and often for life unconnected with the disciples of the same Redeemer around them, on account of difference on minor points of diversity. How still more distressing the thought that ministers of that blessed Saviour who prayed, that all his disciples might "be one," should sometimes confirm the prejudices of such individuals in the hope of some ultimate far distant gain to their sect!

By *ministerial* communion, we would mean that a certificate of good standing in the ministry of one church, ought to be a passport for admission to the ministerial ranks of any other church, if connected with a credible profession of attachment to the standards of government, discipline and form of worship in the other; and if the judicature applied to, believe the applicant

possessed of the qualifications, gifts and graces required by said standards, and calculated to be useful in the midst of them. This feature also exists in the practice of most of the churches. It is not at all unusual for ministers of the Congregational, Presbyterian, and Low Dutch churches to transfer their relations. Between the Lutheran and the Moravian churches in this country the same is the case. Several of our most respected and useful ministers were trained in the church of the United Brethren and transferred their relations to our larger and more destitute Zion. Ministers coming with good credentials from the Evangelical church in Germany, apply indifferently either to the Lutheran or German Reformed church in this country, and are received by both. As the spirit of christian union increases, we suppose these cases of transfer will probably multiply ; and that it will cease in any case to be odious for a minister, at any time of life, to transfer his relations to another church either from want of employment in his own, or because on more mature examination, or observation of their practical effects, he believes the forms of the latter more scriptural or better calculated to advance the kingdom of Christ.

Ministerial communion also implies the mutual acknowledgement of each other's official character by the clergy of the confederated churches. On this point it may be thought some difficulty would exist in the minds of some of our Episcopal brethren. This difficulty, if it exist at all, must be confined to the high-church party, and does not embarrass those who embrace episcopacy, not from the belief of its scriptural authority, but on the ground of expediency ; and of this class far the largest portion of that church has always been. To this class have belonged archbishop Whitgift, Dr. Willet, bishops Bilson, Morton, Jewell, Croft, Burnet, Dr. Whitaker, archbishops Usher, and Tillotson, Drs. Stillingfleet, and Hawies, Sir Peter King, and the venerable Dr. White, late bishop of the Episcopal church in Pennsylvania, as well as, if we mistake not, the great mass of Episcopal divines and laity in this country. In a pamphlet of the last named respectable author, published many years ago, principally to recommend a temporary departure from the line of episcopal succession, on the ground that bishops could not then be had, he uses this language : " Now if even those who hold episcopacy to be of divine right, conceive the obligation to it not to be binding, when that idea would be destructive of public worship ; much more must *they* think so, who indeed

venerate and prefer that form as the most ancient and eligible, but *without any idea of divine right* in the case. This the author believes to be the sentiment of *the great body* of Episcopalians in America, in which respect they have in their favor unquestionably the *sense of the church of England*, and as he believes the opinion of her *most distinguished prelates for piety, virtue and abilities.*" But we have no doubt, that even our high-church brethren do in spirit (though not in form) admit the ministerial character of other clergy ; and we take pleasure in being able to cite the opinion of Dr. H. U. Onderdonk, bishop of the Episcopal church in Pennsylvania in confirmation of our belief. There will therefore be little if any difficulty from this source. See his Tract on "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," p. 6.

FIFTH FEATURE. *In all matters not relating to the government, discipline and forms of worship of individual churches, but pertaining to the common cause of Christianity, let the principle of coöperation regardless of sect, be adopted so far as the nature of the case will admit and as fast as the views of the parties will allow.* The Scriptures present us with no example of regular organization for extensive benevolent operations. The church is thus left to choose in view of the principles of the New Testament, and the results of her own progressive experience. The forms of christian associated agency in the benevolent enterprises of our day, are usually distinguished as voluntary and ecclesiastical. This designation, however, seems not to be entirely accurate ; for the ecclesiastical are also in one sense voluntary, and the voluntary are ecclesiastical, inasmuch as they are conducted by members of the christian church. More properly at least in reference to the subject under discussion, they might be distinguished as catholic and denominational. Now as the denominational are based on the principle of sect, which we have found so detrimental to the Redeemer's kingdom ; it is evident that those who would labor for this unity and aid in accomplishing the Saviour's prayer, should so far as the nature of the case admits, prefer those catholic institutions, in which such as profess to be brethren are found acting out their profession. That these catholic institutions exert a most benign influence in mitigating the rigors of sectarian asperity and in knitting together in love the hearts of those engaged in them, can be doubted by no one acquainted with the history of the American Bible, Tract, Education and

Missionary Societies. That they are at least as efficient as the denominational organizations, and have enjoyed at least as signal evidences of the divine favor, will also not be disputed. If the parent or national societies be supposed to have too great a concentration of power, let coördinate branches be multiplied and be as nearly independent of the parent institution as experience may prove to be desirable, and each branch mainly do the work within its own bounds. Yet the branches also should be catholic in their structure, should embrace all such individuals and congregational societies within their designated bounds, as are willing to coöperate among the different denominations.

But it by no means follows, that denominational societies must of necessity be wholly sectarian in their operations. They are so only when their funds are applied exclusively to the propagation of Christianity connected with the sectarian peculiarities of the church with which they are connected; when beneficiaries are selected exclusively from the members of that denomination; and are sustained only when having in view the ministry in that church. The spirit of catholic union leads us to rejoice at the progress of the Master's kingdom in any of its acknowledged forms, and to be willing to aid an individual to labor in any portion of the Lord's vineyard, rather than that he should not enter the vineyard at all. Let those, therefore, who prefer denominational societies, and desire to promote the unity of Christ's body, adopt the catholic principles of action, and enter into some rules of coöperation and non-interference with the other societies, and although not so entirely favorable to catholicism as the purely catholic institutions, they would be hailed by the friends of union as fellow-laborers in the common cause of apostolic catholicism.

In addition to the superior tendency to union in the catholic or voluntary associations, they enable individual Christians and congregations in their primary capacity, themselves to appropriate their funds immediately to such purposes as they prefer, without the intervention of ecclesiastical bodies. This may lead Christians generally to feel their responsibility more sensibly, to inquire into the merits of different christian enterprises more fully, and thus to become more deeply interested in them.

In order the more perfectly to secure to the catholic associations their ecclesiastical and orthodox character, it might not be amiss for the parent institutions and primary branches to incorporate in their constitutions an acknowledgement of the *Apos-*

tolie Protestant Confession, requiring a subscription to it from all their principal executive officers, their beneficiaries and their missionaries both foreign and domestic. These societies are even now amply secured on this point by their regulations, which require, that every beneficiary shall be member of some christian church, and that every missionary sent either into the domestic or foreign field, shall be in regular connection and good standing in the ministry of some orthodox denomination. Still as the proposed creed is a catholic one, there would be a congruity in its distinctive acknowledgement by catholic societies, and it would tend to give still greater prominence to the common faith.

SIXTH FEATURE. *The Bible should as much as possible be made the text-book in all religious and theological instruction.* It is incontrovertible that in consequence of the great abundance even of good uninspired works, the book of God in its naked form just as its author made it, receives less attention than it merits. We would not, of course, object to elementary books for the instruction of children and youth ; yet it seems desirable, that they contain only the common ground of christian doctrine. Many of the books, employed in training the rising generation, are tinctured by sectarian peculiarities, whilst others are professedly sectarian, and cannot fail to leave impressions unfriendly to the cause of union. Every denomination must indeed have full liberty to use such works for purposes of instruction without being upbraided : yet it cannot fail to be perceived, that the unity of Christ's body will be best subserved by occupying the attention of children mainly with the ground and common truths of our holy religion, by preferring elementary books of an unsectarian character, and by the early use of the Bible as the chief book of study and instruction. It is moreover due to that blessed volume, that it should not only be called the best of books, but also treated as such ; and be made use of on all suitable occasions, not so much with the view of establishing, by detached quotations, positions already made out, as for the analytic study of the book itself. For this cause Bible classes are deserving of high commendation, even admitting that disputed points are sometimes discussed. The scholar is still employed in the direct study of the word of God, and will learn to judge for himself. Those books of instruction, such as the Bible questions of the American Sunday School Union, which

require the scholar unavoidably and constantly to refer to the Bible for answers, are peculiarly appropriate.

In theological seminaries also the Bible should as much as possible be made the subject of direct study on all the different branches of theology; and on every topic the student should be required to search the Scriptures for himself, and present the results of his examination. This course is in a greater or or less degree already pursued in many of our principal schools of the prophets. Yet it is probable, that it might be carried to greater extent. In Biblical History, in Doctrinal, Practical and Polemical Theology this plan can be employed with the utmost facility, and its undoubted tendency is to obliterate sectarian prejudices and distinctions, and to promote alike christian union and Bible truth. The more we can fix the attention of the student to the word of God, the better shall we be able to raise up a generation of ministers disengaged from the shackles of sectarianism, and firmly planted on the broad platform of the Bible; men possessing the most enlarged views of the Redeemer's kingdom, and ready to devise and execute millennial schemes for its advancement.

THE SEVENTH AND LAST FEATURE, of union is that missionaries, going into foreign lands, ought to use and profess no other than this common creed, the Apostolic Protestant Confession, and connect with it whatever form of church-government and mode of worship they prefer.

For the sake of our bleeding Saviour, our sectarian divisions ought not to be carried to heathen lands. The Protestant churches amount to but sixty millions out of seven hundred millions, the probable population of our entire globe, and ought not to spread the Corinthian contagion of sectarianism over the gentile world. In view of all the divisions and contentions, which sectarianism has entailed on the heritage of God, how much better would it be, that the disciples of the Lord, instructed by the experience of three hundred years of discord in the household of faith, should settle down on some better plan for preserving the unity of the church, as her triumphs are extending into heathen countries! The signs of the times imperiously call us to this duty; and a more convenient season cannot be expected in the providence of God. Deeply impressed with the conviction that something can, and therefore something ought to be done, the writer, whose attention has for many

years been directed to this subject, felt constrained to address this fraternal appeal to the American churches. Whether that Divine Saviour, who has promised to be with his disciples unto the end of the world, will incline the hearts of his children to heed this appeal, the future must develope. But whether or not, the writer feels, that he will have discharged a solemn duty, and he cannot resist the conviction that some good will accrue to the kingdom of the blessed Saviour. It is certainly supremely desirable that the unity of the church should be restored in christian lands, and that the sacramental host who bear the standard of the cross into the heathen world, should present an undivided front. Better that the heathen should never hear of Luther, and Calvin, and Arminius, and Wesley, and base their religion purely on the Bible, than that the sectarian divisions connected with these names should be carried among them, still to vex, and agitate and paralyze the church.

Whilst the entire pagan world is before them no two sects ought to send missionaries into the same district of country. Thus the immediate collision of sects would be prevented for a season. Yet if they take with them their extended sectarian creeds, it will not be long before dissenters from it, will grow up among their own disciples, and thus the old evil soon return. But if a creed covering only the common, undisputed ground of Christianity be taken, there will be no need of disciplining any but such as ought to be excluded from all christian churches, and therefore could not form any *christian* sect. And as the Scriptures present us with no entire detailed system of church-government, our predilections on that subject are produced chiefly by the influence and example of parents and teachers, and there is little, very little probability of secession from any of the churches in heathen lands, on this ground.

In addition to these fundamental features of the projected union, Christians should endeavor gradually to restore unity or mutual acknowledgement in *name*, as well as in the thing. *Geographical* names should be adopted for all catholic or voluntary associations, which may be erected. In this respect the American Education, Tract, Bible, Missionary and other societies have set a noble example. Each denomination should speak of itself not as *the* church, but as a *branch* of the church. How delightful would it be, to hear Christians habitually employing phraseology indicative of their unity, and to hear them speak of

The Lutheran *Branch* of the church,
The Episcopal *Branch* of the church,
The Presbyterian *Branch* of the church,
The Methodist *Branch* of the church, etc. etc.

Thus would we literally verify the declaration of the Lord's prophet, "And the Lord will be king over all the earth; in that day there will be one Lord and *his name one*." Zech. 14: 9.

As to one *Supreme Representative Body*, having even limited jurisdiction over all the confederated bodies, for which some may have been looking as a feature of this plan of union—there was none such in the apostolic age, and we need none. The tendency of such bodies is naturally to an increase of power—they are the foster-mothers of papacy, and dangerous to true liberty of conscience.

Should any circumstances in the Providence of God, hereafter render it necessary, and the great body of the confederated denominations unite in the call, a mere advisory council might be convened, consisting of a small senatorial delegation, in equal numbers from each denomination, without legislative or judicial power, its advice to be confined to the general interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. Yet even such a council ought not to meet statedly nor often, and forms no part of the proposed union.

THE APOSTOLIC, PROTESTANT CONFESSION,

for which the reader is now prepared, is nothing more than a selection of such articles or parts of articles, on the topics determined by the several confessions, as are believed by all the so-called orthodox churches. Not a single word is altered or added. The *authority* of this confession is based on the fact, that every sentence, every idea of it, has been sanctioned by one or other of the Protestant conventions that adopted the creeds from which the articles are selected, and by the denominations receiving those creeds. The whole creed has therefore already received the ecclesiastical sanction of acknowledged churches. Its sanction in *its present form* and *for the proposed purpose*, it can only receive by the successive action of such ecclesiastical bodies, and churches and individuals as in the Providence of God may receive it, and publish their assent to it, not as renouncing any of their former opinions, but as regarding this as the test for discipline and communion.

THE APOSTOLIC, PROTESTANT CONFESSION.

PART I. *The Apostles' Creed.*

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, the Maker of heaven and earth : And in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord ; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried.—The third day he rose from the dead, he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

"I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic or universal church ; the communion of saints ; the forgiveness of sins ; the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting."

PART II. *The United Protestant Confession.*

ART. I. *Of the Scriptures.*

The Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation : so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.¹ Under the name of the Holy Scriptures, or the word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testament, which are these :

Genesis,	Nehemiah,	Obadiah,
Exodus,	Esther,	Jonah,
Leviticus,	Job,	Micah,
Numbers,	Psalms,	Nahum,
Deuteronomy,	Proverbs,	Habakkuk,
Joshua,	Ecclesiastes,	Zephaniah,
Judges,	Song of Solomon,	Haggai,
Ruth,	Isaiah,	Zechariah,
I. Samuel,	Jeremiah,	Malachi,
II. Samuel,	Lamentations,	Matthew,
I. Kings,	Ezekiel,	Mark,
II. Kings,	Daniel,	Luke,
I. Chronicles,	Hosea,	John,
II. Chronicles,	Joel,	Acts of the Apostles,
Ezra,	Amos,	Epistle to the Romans,

¹ Articles of the Episcopal church, Art. VI. and of the Discipline of the Methodist church, Art. V.

I. Corinthians,	II. Thessalonians,	I. Peter,
II. Corinthians,	I. Timothy,	II. Peter,
Galatians,	II. Timothy,	I. John,
Ephesians,	Titus,	II. John,
Philippians,	Philemon,	III. John,
Colossians,	Hebrews,	Jude,
I. Thessalonians,	Epistle of James,	Revelation.

All which are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life. The books commonly called *Apocrypha*, not being of divine inspiration are no part of the canon of the Scripture.¹

ART. II. *Of God and the Trinity.*

Our churches with one accord teach, that there is one God, eternal, incorporeal, indivisible, infinite in power, wisdom and goodness, the creator and preserver of all things visible and invisible ; and yet, that there are three persons, who are of the same essence and power, and are coëternal, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.²

ART. III. *Of the Son of God and the Atonement.*

They likewise teach, that the Word, that is, the Son of God, assumed human nature, so that the two natures human and divine, united in one person, constitute one Christ, who is true God and man ; born of the virgin Mary ; and truly suffered, was crucified, died, and was buried, that he might be a sacrifice for the sins of men.³

ART. IV. *Of Human Depravity.*

God having made a covenant of works and of life thereupon with our first parents ; they, seduced by the subtilty and temptation of Satan, did wilfully transgress and break the covenant by eating the forbidden fruit.⁴ By this sin they fell from their

¹ Ratio Disciplinae or Constitution of the Congregational Churches, Art. I. § 2. 3. and Confession of the Presbyterian Church, Art. I. § 2. 3. The Calvinistic Baptists are supposed generally to agree in the views of this Confession, though they have not formally adopted it : and the Confession of the Dutch Reformed Church is also of the same general doctrinal import.

² Lutheran and Moravian (United Brethren's) Confession, Art. I.

³ Idem, Art. III. according to the translation contained in the writer's " Popular Theology."

⁴ Congregational, Art. VI. 1.

original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin.¹ They being the root of all mankind, a corrupted nature is conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation.² The condition of man after the fall of Adam, is such,³ that his will is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined to do good or evil:⁴ but it does not possess the power, without the influence of the Holy Spirit, of being just before God.⁵

ART. V. *Of Justification.*

We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith; and not for our own works or deservings.⁶ This faith must bring forth good fruits; and it is our duty to perform those good works which God has commanded, because he has enjoined them, and not in the expectation of thereby meriting justification before him.⁷ Good works cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment.⁸

ART. VI. *Of the Church.*

The visible church, which is catholic or universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation), consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. Unto this catholic, visible church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles and ordinances of God.⁹ For the true unity of the church, it is not necessary that the same rites and ceremonies, instituted by men, should be everywhere observed.¹⁰ The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error;¹¹ nevertheless, Christ always hath had and ever shall have a visible kingdom in this world to the end thereof, of such as believe in him and make profession

¹ Presbyterian, Art. VI. 2.

² Congregational, Art. VI. 3.

³ Episcopal, Art. X.

⁴ Presbyt. and Congreg. IX. 1.

⁵ Lutheran and Moravian Conf. Art. XVIII.

⁶ Episcopal Conf. Art. XI. and Methodist, Art. IX.

⁷ Lutheran and Moravian Conf. Art. VI.

⁸ Methodist Discip. Art. X. and Episcopal Conf. Art. XII.

⁹ Presbyterian Conf. Art. XXV. 2. 3.

¹⁰ Lutheran and Moravian, Art. VII.

¹¹ Presb. XXV. 3. and Cong. XXVI. 3.

of his name.¹ There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ : nor can the pope of Rome in any sense be the head thereof.²

ART. VII. *Of the Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.*

The sacraments were instituted not only as marks of a christian profession among men ; but rather as signs and evidences of the divine disposition towards us, tendered for the purpose of exciting and confirming the faith of those who use them.³ There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.⁴ Baptism is ordained not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church ; but also to be unto him a sign of the covenant of grace, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life.⁵ The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves ; but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death.⁶

In this sacrament Christ is not offered up, nor any real sacrifice made at all, for remission of sins of the quick or dead ; so that the popish sacrifice of the mass, as they call it, is most injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice.⁷ That doctrine which maintains a change of the bread and wine into Christ's body and blood (commonly called transubstantiation) by consecration of a priest, or in any other way, is repugnant not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason.⁸ The denying of the cup to the people, and worshipping the elements, or carrying them about for adoration, are all contrary to the institution of Christ.⁹

¹ Congregational Conf. Art. XXVI. 3.

² Congr. XXVI. 4. and Presb. XXV. 6.

³ Lutheran and Moravian Conf. Art. XIII.

⁴ Presb. Art. XXVII. 4. and Congr. XXVIII. 4.

⁵ Presb. Art. XXVIII. 1.

⁶ Methodist Disc. Art. XVIII. and Episc. Art. XXVIII.

⁷ Presb. Art. XXIX. 2. and Cong. XXX. 2.

⁸ Presb. Conf. Art. XXIX. 6. and Cong. XXX. 6.

⁹ Presb. XXIX. 4. Cong. XXX. 4.

ART. VIII. *Of Purgatory, etc.*

The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, worshipping as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is repugnant to the word of God.¹

ART. IX. *Liberty of Conscience.*

God alone is the Lord of conscience and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in any wise contrary to his word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and, the requiring of an implicit faith and an absolute and blind obedience is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also.²

ART. X. *Of Civil Government.*

God the supreme Lord and king of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under him, over the people, for his own glory and the public good; and to this end hath armed them with power, for the defence and encouragement of them that do good, and for the punishment of evil-doers.³ The power of the civil magistrate extendeth to all men, as well clergy as laity in things temporal; but hath no authority in things purely spiritual.⁴ Christians ought to yield obedience to the civil officers and laws of the land: unless they should command something sinful; in which case it is a duty to obey God rather than man.⁵

ART. XI. *Communion of Saints.*

Saints are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edification: As also in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities; which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended to all those who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.⁶

¹ Methodist Disc. Art. XIV. and Episcopal, Art. XXII.

² Presb. XX. 2.

³ Cong. XXIV. 1. and Presb. XXIII. 1.

⁴ Episc. XXXVII.

⁵ Lutheran and Moravian, Art. XVI.

⁶ Cong. XXVII. 2. and Presb. XXVI. 2.

ART. XII. *Of the Future Judgment and Retribution.*

At the end of the world Christ will appear for judgment, he will raise the dead, he will give to the pious eternal life and endless joys ; but will condemn wicked men and devils to be punished without end.¹ As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded, that there shall be a day of judgment, to deter all men from sin ; so will he have that day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security and be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come, and may be ever prepared to say, *Come, Lord Jesus, Come quickly. Amen.*²

MODE OF OPERATION.

It only remains that a few words be said as to the manner in which this plan could with very little delay be adopted by all who approve of its principles and are desirous of coöperating in restoring unity to the body of Christ.

The call of a general convention of all the friends of the cause would probably not be expedient nor extensively successful ; nor indeed is it necessary.

I. Let the friends of union, be they benevolent individuals or associations, extensively circulate this appeal among the different churches, ministers and laity.

II. Let the friends of the cause invite the different ecclesiastical bodies to which they belong to investigate the plan, and so soon as they approve of it adopt it each for itself and resolve henceforth to act upon it.

III. If any orthodox denomination find in it a single article or sentence or idea, which *positively*, (not by inference) teaches what they regard as error, let them strike it out, and adopt the residue. The writer is however not aware that such a clause is found in it. Other denominations would then also omit it as a disputed point, not belonging to the common ground of Protestantism, and the residue remain as the *United Protestant Confession*, regularly adopted by the confederated denominations.

IV. Let vacant churches, and Christians of different denominations in destitute villages and neighborhoods be encouraged

¹ Lutheran and Moravian Conf. Art. XVII.

² Presbyterian, XXXIII. 3. Congregational, XXXII. 3.

to unite in adopting the Apostolic Protestant Confession, and plan of union, and join in calling a minister of any one of the confederated churches.

V. Let each of the confederated denominations and missionary societies both voluntary and denominational resolve not to send a minister into any village or neighborhood already adequately supplied by a minister from another branch of the union, but advise their members to unite with their confederated brethren in supporting the minister already stationed among them, or some other one of good standing in either of the confederated denominations, in whose support they can agree.

VI. Whenever the confederated population of a district is unable to support a minister, let application be made to the proper officers of the missionary society of their choice, for such aid as they may need.

VII. Let the education and missionary societies of the confederated churches confer with each other, adopt rules of co-operation, and resolve with renewed ardor by the help of God to supply every destitute place in our land with faithful ministers, and labor with re-doubled zeal in the definite enterprise of sending the Gospel to every rational creature throughout "the field of the world."

This plan would tend to produce unity of spirit first, whilst it will prepare the way for greater unity in external forms; if the Lord designs to effect it. If its prominent features were faithfully carried out, the Protestant church would present as much external unity of organization, as that of the apostolic age, and therefore in all probability as much as is desirable; whilst, happy consummation! the members of the Saviour's body would again have the same care one for another; and whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it! and the intellect of the christian church would no longer be expended in internal contentions, but all her energies be directed to the conversion of the world.

In conclusion, we would commend this humble, well-meant effort to the blessing of that divine Saviour, who has watched over his church amidst all the vicissitudes of her history. If this plan is accordant with his will, may he graciously accept and prosper it; and if not, may he defeat it, and at the day of final account, regard with favor the upright intention from which it has emanated!

ARTICLE IV.

CAUSES OF THE DENIAL OF THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE
PENTATEUCH.

Translated from the German of Prof. Hengstenberg of Berlin, by Rev. E. Ballantine, Assistant Instructor in the Union Theol. Sem., Prince Edward, Virginia.

Introductory Notice, by the Translator.

[THE following article is a translation of the greater portion of the *Prolegomena* to the last work published by Hengstenberg, entitled *Authenticité des Pentateuchs*, Bd. I. (Authenticity of the Pentateuch, Vol. I.) This work is another step in prosecution of the author's design of giving to the world a complete work on Introduction to the Old Testament. The general title of that work is *Beyträge zur Einleitung ins Alte Testament* (Contributions to Introduction to the Old Testament), of which this is the first part of the second volume. The first volume was upon the Authenticity of Daniel and the Integrity of Zechariah. The author takes up his topics not in regular order, but as he judges them to be called for by the state of things. He thus gives the course and order which he has chosen for the discussion of his subjects (Vorwort zur Authenticité des Daniel und der Integrität des Sacharjah): "the antiquity of Job, the age and credibility of the books of Chronicles and Esther, the sources of the historical books, the allegorical interpretation of the Song of Solomon, etc., and afterwards, if the Lord give life and health, all other topics of Introduction; so that these *Beyträge* when completed, may, with the help of copious synopses and indexes, serve as a Manual of Introduction." May the Lord speed his work.—Those who are acquainted with the fundamental investigations of Hengstenberg are prepared to expect in the work before us one worthy of the subject. The call for such a work may be inferred from the author's statement of the different opinions on the authorship of the Pentateuch, *infra* pp. 31—38. Its design is, to vindicate the Mosaic origin, and so the historic truth, of the Pentateuch. This volume refutes the objection made to its Mosaic origin from the supposed later discovery and use of the art of writing; proves the existence of the Pentateuch in the kingdom of Israel by the Samaritan Pentateuch, and quotations of and allusions to the

Pentateuch in the books of Kings, Hosea, and Amos; and by a fundamental investigation into the signification and mutual relation of the different names of God, and the use of them in the Pentateuch, shows that that book is the connected work of one author. The chapters on the Samaritan Pentateuch, on the Names of God, and on the history of the Art of Writing, would if translated, be interesting and useful Articles for the Repository.

The course of the whole discussion on the authenticity of the Pentateuch is thus indicated by the author (S. LXXXII): "After the settlement of the preliminary question on the relation of the genuineness of the book to the history of writing, it must be proved from the unity of object and plan, of circumstances and of language, that the Pentateuch is a closely connected whole, which could have been produced only by one author. (Here belongs our investigation on the Divine names.) Then it is to be shown that in the work itself, Moses is designated as the author. Then we must inquire how the whole after development of the people, and their literature, stands related to the Pentateuch. For if the Pentateuch is from Moses, it must have formed the basis not only of the civil but also of the religious life of the people. (Here belongs the chapter on the relation of the Pentateuch to the kingdom of Israel.) Then it is to be shown that the *internal* character of the Pentateuch is not opposed to the genuineness, but rather necessarily supposes it. Here are to be examined the philological, the historical, and finally the theological character of the Pentateuch. As Appendix, it is to be shown that the testimony of Christ and his apostles, as well as the relation of the Pentateuch to Divine revelation as a whole, is all in favor of its genuineness. This appendix is of course designed only for those who on the subjects of revelation and inspiration agree with the author."

The *Prolegomena* to this work, the greater part of which is contained in the following Article, are designed to show the *causes* why the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch has been denied. The author shows convincingly that these causes have been any thing else than want of proof for the genuineness. In pointing out these causes, he has given us a striking and interesting history and character of Rationalism or rather of infidelity in Germany. He has pointed out the position occupied by many of the leading men of Germany of the last and the present century, and has shown the weakness and the danger-

ous tendencies of the reigning speculative philosophy of Germany. The interesting fact that all the historians of note maintain the historical character and credibility (at least in the main) of the Pentateuch—and the remarks upon internal and external evidence, are themselves of sufficient importance to claim the attention of our religious public, and afford to all interested in the state of religion in Germany, ground of cheering hope. And when God raises up such able and fearless defenders of the Bible as Hengstenberg, it may be inferred that he is designing good for his Israel there. The pledge which the author gives (p. 31, note), while it strikingly shows on what strong ground he feels himself to be, is well calculated to diminish our respect for the reigning opinions and learning of Germany. Can we in happy America behold this champion thus earnestly contending for the Bible, and not be interested—not pray for him.—TRANSLATOR.

CAUSES OF THE DENIAL OF THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH.

Shallow and Skeptical Interpretation.

It is by no means our object to give a complete external history of investigations on the genuineness of the Pentateuch. A commencement has been made to such a work by *Harttmann*; and it would be of little use to correct and enlarge his collections of names, titles and short summaries of works. It is better to pass over every work which has not had a strong influence on the course of the contest, and which was only a repetition and a re-arrangement of what had been advanced by others, not the result of original and profound investigation. Otherwise we might be in danger of not seeing the forest on account of the multitude of trees.

We attend then only to the substance of the history. Our object is chiefly to show why it is that the genuineness of the Pentateuch, which had before been considered as scientifically established, has for the last sixty years had to suffer so many attacks, and has been contested and denied with so much boldness and so great success.

We designedly give to our inquiry these narrow limits. Scattering attacks upon the genuineness of the Pentateuch, it is well known, were made as early as the seventeenth century. The

history of these attacks, in which *Spinoza* acts the principal part, may be seen in *Carpzov*, *Introd.* I. p. 38 seq., and in *Witsius*, *An Moses auctor Pentat.*, in his *Miscell.* I. p. 102 seq. But if we succeed in accounting for the opposition to the Pentateuch as now fully developed and in well understanding its own character and bearings, it will be easy to show the causes of those first feeble attempts.

We will consider in the first place *the character of commentation on the Pentateuch in the times preceding the crisis.*—A book such as the Pentateuch is, will be regarded as genuine and authentic no longer than it is expounded as an inspired one. If it is read as a profane work, if its depths are not fathomed, if its meaning is diluted and weakened, then the belief in its genuineness has also received a blow; and if that genuineness is not immediately denied, this is simply an inconsistency, which, since every tendency of things must in the long run arrive at its result, will in time give way. If the Pentateuch does not stand above all human productions in regard to its doctrines and its spirit, if these are not regarded as the greatest miracle it exhibits, if recourse is had to bold and forced apologies for gross violations of probability; then the miracles and prophecies which the Pentateuch records will no longer save its credit, but will serve to hasten its downfall. Defenders of the Bible upon merely external evidence have no right to demand that we examine the truth of miracles and prophecies just as we do that of any other fact. The pagan miracles would not be worthy of credit even if reported by those in whom otherwise we have every reason to place confidence. If we place the credibility of the Mosaic and of the heathen miracles upon the same ground (of external evidence) by leaving out of view the moral excellencies of that with which the former were connected, and thus overlook the finger of God in them, we can then no more complain of those who make these very miracles a reason for denying the genuineness of the Pentateuch.* This indeed would

* Even Hengstenberg then maintains the idea that the supernatural facts of the Bible history are not, considered aside from their connection with Bible doctrines, capable of being substantiated by historic evidence. Hume went only one step further, and denied their credibility even when thus connected. It is difficult not to feel that such an idea when held by one who believes as Hengstenberg does, that these supernatural events did actually happen, is perfectly absurd. The external evidence for the miracles of Moses and of Jesus is suf-

be to contend not for the Pentateuch, but for a fiction of our own which we have substituted for it. And he also who fights against this, attacks not the giant himself, but only his shadow, a bug-bear standing in his place.

The close connection of a belief in the genuineness of the Pentateuch with a correct and profound exposition of it, appears at once from this, that the first weak attacks on its genuineness had their ground in an utter incapacity of interpretation. In the Clementine Homilies (*Patres apostol. ed. Cotel. T. I.*) the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is denied on account of a number of difficulties which have no existence except for the crudest understanding. It is there said, viz. that God cannot lie, cannot tempt, because this supposes ignorance, that he cannot repent or be grieved, that he cannot harden the heart, that he, the All-sufficient, can desire no offering, cannot please himself with lambs, etc. Comp. especially *homil. 2, 6. 43. 44.** The Pentateuch as thus unconsciously falsified by this author was most certainly not genuine.

With Calvin the theological exposition of the Pentateuch reached its highest point—I mean relatively. He stands much higher above those that followed, than above those that preceded him. It is indeed wonderful how such a man could have such successors. Doubtless, it is to be explained only by the fact that they left him entirely unread—a fact which is indeed every where manifest. It is impossible that he who has thoroughly studied Calvin should be so settled and consistent in shallowness of exposition as they show themselves throughout to be. We will here notice only the three men who have exerted the most extensive influence—*Spencer, Clericus, and J. D. Michaelis*. Others who had the same tendency, as *Grotius*,

ficient to warrant the credence of one who is entirely ignorant of their character and doctrines as religious teachers. The internal evidence is not, therefore, however, either less convincing or important.—*Tr.*

* See also 6. 52. where the author says, it cannot be true that Noah was drunk, that Abraham had *three* wives and Jacob *four*, and that Moses was guilty of manslaughter—a remark that falls of itself as soon as we understand the object of the author not according to our own notions, but as it appears in his work. For then we should see at the commencement of the work, this motto standing: “Lord, to thee belongs the honor, but to us shame and confusion, that the weaknesses of thy chosen ones do, as far as they can consist with virtue in the heart, promote, instead of defeating the object of the work.”

and *Marsham*, either have not carried it through so consistently or did not make the exposition of the Pentateuch a subject of special attention ; so that the marks of their influence are lost in that of their leaders.*

Spencer, † whose labors in the exposition of the Pentateuch lie before us in his work *de legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus*, has in this day found a fellow-spirit in *Strauss*. ‡ There is in both the same acuteness, united with such an incredible want of depth that one is often tempted to regard their acuteness itself as doubtful. In both the same icy coldness, the same impotence in a religious point of view, the same *virtuoso-spirit*, so to speak, in repressing all pious feeling, so that even the faintest religious emotions do not show themselves in them, to interrupt the perfect carrying out of their principles. In both, the same clearness and precision of representation, which indeed, are so much the easier to attain the more the understanding becomes isolated and brings into subjection the other faculties of the soul. There is this difference between the two, that *Spencer* was satisfied with operating against Revelation, at a single point. This difference however is accidental, and is caused only by the difference of the times in which they lived. One cannot free himself from the thought, that were *Spencer* now living, he would lay aside this modesty ; nay, that he even then thought far more than he said. Another difference—in reference to learning—is still more incidental and unessential.

The very fundamental idea of *Spencer's* book shows how incapable he was of expounding the sacred writings—how these under his hands lose all their spirit and have nothing left but the dead letter. This idea—in the main correct, though by him

* The view given of these men here must of course be partial. Their merits in other respects have nothing to do with our present object ; and if not mentioned, are not at all intended to be denied.

† John *Spencer*, D. D. born 1630, died 1693, Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Dean of Ely. His work noticed in the text, is, according to Prof. Tholuck, calculated in the highest degree to prepare the mind for Rationalism.

‡ Author of a "Life of Jesus," in which he makes out the Gospel history to be made up of fables and religious mythi. See *infra*, pp. 25, 27, 39. This work has been answered by Tholuck in his '*Glaubwürdigkeit d. evangelischen Geschichte*' (Credibility of the Gospel History), Hamburg, 1837, a book which in many respects deserves to stand by the side of Paley's *Horae Paulinae*.

carried much too far—is, that much in the ceremonial law of Moses shows a striking coincidence with the religious usages of heathen nations, especially of the Egyptians. This coincidence is only in the form; and there is not the least difficulty in explaining and justifying it, as soon as it is shown that the *spirit* of the Mosaic economy, which animates this external form is one entirely new. It is perfectly natural that for the external representation of that which is *really* sacred, forms should be chosen which have been already in long and established use for the representation of that *reputed* to be so, and which have thus themselves acquired a sacred character. Who thinks of drawing any conclusions unfavorable to Christian baptism from the fact of religious ablutions having been in use among the Jews and all other nations of antiquity? But this difference of spirit—that on which all depends—Spencer was incapable of seeing. To him the ceremonial law of Moses is a body without a soul. He admits in some parts of it, it is true, a mystical and typical character (*ratio mystica et typica*), but only in a few cases, and he declares this to be a subordinate, not the great design of the ritual. Hence, even the moderate and mild *Pfaff*, in his *dissertatio praeliminaris* to his edition of Spencer's book, says: "You will say that the author said this by way of gratuitous concession, and that he might not appear to deny the typical character of the ritual altogether."* But even when he admits a spiritual meaning, he accounts for it by referring to an entirely external cause. Hear him—"it is probable that God in the law, did deliver some sacred things covered up under the veil of types and symbols, because of a similar custom in use among the wise men of different nations and especially the Egyptians."† In general, however, he sees no difference at all between the heathen usages and those of the Israelites which externally corresponded to them. God adopted the heathenish usages as they were, in order to afford his people that entertainment and amusement which they would otherwise have sought in idolatry. This is expressed as grossly as possible for example on p. 640: "God in the mean time that he might in every way prevent

* "Dicis saltem gratia et ne rationem typicam prorsus eliminare videatur, dixisse hoc videtur auctor."

† Verosimile est, Deum sacratoria quaedam, symbolorum et typorum velis obducta, in lege tradidisse, ob morem affinem, inter gentium, Aegyptiorum praecipue sapientes usitatum."

superstition, adopted not a few rites made sacred by the use of many ages and nations *and which he knew to be tolerable follies.*"*—He every where speaks of the ceremonial law with the most contemptuous expressions. This is indeed very natural as long as the prayer 'Lord! show me wondrous things out of thy law,' is not made and therefore never answered; especially in the case of those who have too high an opinion of themselves not to consider their not seeing a thing as proof that it does not exist. Compare for instance p. 26: "No reason can be given why God should choose to burden the Jewish people with so many useless laws and rites as almost to bury under them intellectual worship, except that he might by that heavy yoke prevent the people from leaping the bounds of their duty, and rushing into the religious observances of the heathen. For it is admitted and manifest, that rites of this kind have no affinity with the character of God, and that such an apparatus of ceremonies is not necessary to the cultivation of piety."†—The connection between the inability to expound and the denial of the genuineness of the Pentateuch is here very plain. If the ceremonial law is understood as being a perfect contrast to that worship of God which is in spirit and in truth, instead of being a preparation for it, the outward shell, a lower form of it, then indeed nothing can be more absurd than to ascribe its origin to God: much more obvious and natural would it be in that case to say that it passed over from the heathen to the Jews in a purely natural way. And this the rather as in the Pentateuch, God by no means speaks of these rites as follies, but rather places them on equal footing with his moral law, and threatens and commands to punish the non-observance of them with the severest penalties. Otherwise we cannot avoid bringing against God the charge of a *fraus pia*—a charge which Spencer covers up under the respectable name of a *συγκαταβασις* (*accommoda-*

* "Deus interim, ut superstitionis quovis pacto iretur obviam, ritus non paucos, multorum annorum et gentium usu cohonestatos, *quos ineptias norat esse tolerabiles* . . . in sacrorum suorum numerum adoptavit."

† "Nulla ratio occurrit cur deus tot legibus et ritibus inutilibus populum Judaicum onerare et cultum *rationalem* paene obruere voluerit, nisi ut gravi illo iugo, populum impediret, ne officii sui cancellos transiliret, et ad ritus gentilium rueret. Id enim confessum et apertum est, huiusmodi ritus nullum cum dei natura consensum habuisse, nec tanto ceremoniarum apparatu opus fuisse ad pietatem colendam."

tion, condescension), and even remarks that God by instituting these rites *made sport* of his people. See for instance p. 753, where he says, God commanded the offerings perhaps *per ironiam*. — It was shown by the contemporary opponents of Spencer on what a low idea of God his hypothesis is founded. See for example *Witsius*, in his *Aegyptiaca*, p. 282. “But whatever appearance of political wisdom these things may have, they are destitute of foundation in the Bible, and are figments of human ingenuity unworthy of the majesty of Deity. But wise and cunning mortals judge of God by themselves, and ascribe to heaven political arts and manoeuvres which are scarcely respectable on earth. As if, in organizing and establishing his people, *he* needed the low arts of cunning who holds the hearts of men in his hands and turns them whithersoever he will.”* The view given of God is indeed so low, that one might easily conjecture that Spencer himself made his hypothesis only *per ironiam*, expecting that the real truth would be plain to those of his readers who were ripe for it. There are various hints suggesting this thought. So on p. 20: “God appointed many things in the law covered up with the drapery of types and figures, *perhaps that the Mosaic law might encourage an imitation of the spirit and education of Moses.*”† Certain proof however is wanting that Spencer was conscious of the necessary consequences of his hypothesis—and this is, for our purpose, a matter of indifference. It is enough for us that such *were* the consequences—that every aspect of this view of the ceremonial law led to the denial of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. We give for the sake of example a number of consequences which necessarily follow from this hypothesis. Is the character of the ceremonial law of Moses such as Spencer has descri-

* Verum enimvero, quantamcunque haec civilis prudentiae speciem habeant, praeter dei verbum cuncta dicuntur, et humani commenta sunt ingenii, divini numinis haud satis digna. Nimirum cauti cauti-que in seculo mortales deum ex sua metiuntur indole; arcanasque imperandi artes et vaframenta Politicorum, quae vix terra probat, coelo locant. Quasi vero in populo sibi forinando firmandoque, iis astutiarum ambagibus indigeat is qui mortalium corda in manu habens, ea quorsum vult flectit.”—These words J. D. Michaelis might well have taken to heart. (See *infra*, pp. 8, 9.)

† “Deus multa in lege typorum et figurarum tegumentis involuta tradidit, forsan ut lex Mosaica cum ipso Mosis ingenio et educatione consensum coleret.”

bed it?—then it cannot be from God—then Moses who ascribes it to God cannot have been one sent of God—then he cannot have proved himself such by miracles and prophecies—then the Pentateuch which ascribes so many of these to him cannot have been written by him. Spencer was besides not satisfied with robbing the ceremonial law of its deeper significancy and its divine character—he endeavors also as much as possible to take away the substance of the *moral* part of the law. Thus he labors to show, p. 28, that the decalogue is not a general summary of moral duty, but was only designed to keep down gross idolatry.

The influence of Spencer's book was very great, as is shown by the repeated reprints of it, and the editions in Holland and Germany. Even theologians (as *Bossuet*, *Einl. uebers v. Cramer* § 227) were imprudent and short-sighted enough to coincide more or less with him. His opposers, some of them very learned men, mistook the right mode of assaulting the new and remarkable position he had taken. Instead of applying all their strength to a fundamental and sober examination of the symbolic and typical signification of the Mosaic ritual and thus showing the miracle of the law itself, they employed themselves in the fruitless labor of proving that the external forms of the ritual were not borrowed by the Jews from the heathen, but exactly the reverse.* In the meantime theologians continued to explain the ritual in the old arbitrary way, thus affording Spencer some excuse for his hypothesis.

Spencer was followed by *Clericus*,† who adopted the hypotheses of his predecessor without any modification or improvement. Nothing more is necessary for a perfect characterizing of the man in this respect than his remark on circumcision: See his *Comm. Gen. 17: 10*. "It appears to many incredible that a rite of this kind, inconvenient in itself, and when performed on older persons scarcely decent, and which besides can contribute nothing to good morals, was originally instituted

* The view here so unceremoniously rejected by Hengstenberg is maintained by the greatest names among orthodox divines. See especially *Witsius* in his *Egyptiaca*, and *Gale's Court of the Gentiles*. Hengstenberg himself makes a remark (*infra*, p. 39) which would appear to settle the question: "Such an aspeing of what is human by that which is divine would be the greatest absurdity imaginable."—Ta.

† John Le Clerc, Professor at Amsterdam. Ob. 1736.

by the great and good God. They suspect therefore that Abraham who had seen it practised by the Egyptians, thought it an excellent custom ; and that God, who accommodates himself to our weakness with the greatest condescension, when he observed this, commanded Abraham to do that himself which he had approved in others." * The shallowness of religious views and principles, which is indeed a peculiarity of the Arminians, appears in him in its highest degree. The ground which he in reality inwardly takes is entirely a deistical one. Everything that goes beyond his own abstract idea of God, that refers to a living God, he calls at once 'Anthropopathy,' 'Anthropomorphism.' It is to him 'a shell without a kernel.' Remarks of this kind occur so frequently as to be tiresome. He never suspects that his own abstract idea may be itself the grossest anthropomorphism. From his imagined lofty religious height he looks down with pity upon the sacred characters and the sacred writers of the Bible. That such kind of views when they who adopt them have obtained a clear insight into their real character and bearings—(in our times *Gesenius* might be regarded as a *Clericus redivivus*)—must lead to the denial of the genuineness of such books as the Pentateuch, scarcely needs proof. Books which speak so childishly of God, themselves refute the supposition of their inspiration. Miracles and prophecies, which really took place if the Pentateuch is genuine, could have proceeded only from the living God ; and if a man is anxious lest even the *words* of the sacred book be too gross for the deity his reason has formed to itself, how must he feel in regard to those *deeds* which quite break through the pretended brazen walls of nature : That the author also really began to be conscious how little a belief in these last agreed with his fundamental religious principles, appears from the attempt he has made, in only a few cases however, to explain the miracles so as to bring them within the bounds of natural operations. Compare for example his treatise *de maris Idumaei traiectione* (on the passage of the Red Sea), attached to his

* "Parum credibile multis videtur ritum ejusmodi incommodum, et quando a grandioribus suscipiebatur, parum honestum, qui denique neque ad bonos mores quidquam conferre potest, a deo opt. max. primum institutum. Suspiciantur Abrahamum, qui hoc viderat in Aeg. fieri—in illorum sententiam ivisse ; quod cum animadverteret deus, qui summa *συνεπαύβασαι* sese nostrae imbecillitati attemperat, idem Abrahamum jussit facere, quod jam in aliis probabat."

Commentary on the Pentateuch.* He wanted indeed an indispensable requisite to faith in miracles, viz. a knowledge of the dependence of the common laws and course of nature upon God; the miracles therefore appear in his hands as events taking place without means and contrary to rule, and assume almost a grotesque appearance. He has great dread of every thing like depth of meaning. This can be accounted for only by his incapability of comprehension; but often it is plain that there is at bottom the fear, lest by admitting a deeper sense, he may forsake the ground of the natural developement of events, and concede something to the Scriptures which can belong to them only as sacred writings. Thus he uses every means of ridding himself of those passages which show that the limited system of the theocracy was not something opposed to, but a foundation and a preparation for, the universal plan of the Gospel—that the limited was designed as *the means* for the unlimited.

The passage Gen. 12: 3, “In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed,” by which at the call of Abraham, the very beginning of the limited dispensation, this great design of ultimate universality is plainly expressed, is explained by him thus: “That is, by reference to thy name or example shall benedictions be expressed among many oriental nations, in these or similar words: God bless thee as he blessed Abraham.”† He allows himself grossly to violate the laws of the language rather than adopt a sense which, aside from a divine coöperation in the case, was so little to be expected, and which would lead into a field where he did not feel at home. His incapability of theological interpretation indeed exceeds belief. That exposition like his then, must have been a direct preparation for the mythical understanding, and so for the opinion of the spuriousness of the Pentateuch, is shown by a striking example in his remarks on the Fall. That catastrophe is turned by him into a low caricature. He remarks on ch. 2: 9, “As the tree of life may have been a tree whose fruit was medicinal, so the tree of knowledge may have been a poisonous one, which the wise

* Where Clericus contends that the water of the Red Sea was driven by a strong north wind into the Ocean, leaving the bottom where the Israelites passed bare.—Ta.

† “h. e. tuo nomine exemple probato, benedictiones apud plurimos Orientis populos concipientur, his aut similibus verbis: benedicat tibi deus ut benedixit Abrahamo.”

would avoid, and by the eating of which the foolish would become more wise. There may have been several trees of this kind, as there are several species of those that are medicinal. Pliny, l. XII. c. 6. mentions an India fig which he thus describes: 'There is another, sweeter than an apple, but prejudicial to the stomach.' " He adds: " Alexander commanded that no one of his army should touch this fruit;—a circumstance which may illustrate the history before us." * On ch. 3: 7, "and the eyes of them both were opened" he says, " After they had eaten the unlawful fruit, they observed what before they had not attended to, viz. either that they had drawn upon themselves the divine anger, or, *because of the pain in their intestines* that that fruit was noxious instead of their deriving great advantage from it as they had hoped." † On ch. 3: 24, he says: " Grotius thinks this is a Hendiadys, and that 'Cherubim and a flaming sword' is put for 'cherubim, that is, a flaming sword;' and he interprets the flaming sword to be burning fires on the bituminous soil of Babylon, through which alone there was access to Paradise, which therefore was in this way closed to Adam. I rather think Moses meant to say that God sent angels who set on fire the bitumen of the Babylonian or a similar soil, and used this as a flaming sword for keeping men off." ‡.

* " Ut arbor vitæ potest esse arbor cujus fructus essent ἀλεξιήρεις s. medicati, ita arbor prudentiæ erit arbor venenata, quam vitare prudentium est, et cujus gustato fructu imprudens fit prudentior. Hujus generis plures arbores esse potuerunt, quemadmodum plures sunt medicatarum species. Plinius, l. XII. c. 6., meminit cujusdam Indicæ ficus, quam ita describit: est et alia, similis huic, dulcior pomo, sed interaneorum valetudini infesta. Subjicit: edixerat Alexander, nequis agminis sui id pomum adtingeret, qua circumstantia hæc illustrari potest historia."

† " Postquam illicitum fructum comederunt, animadverterunt, quod antea in animum non revocaverant; nempe aut se sibi divinam iram conciliasse; aut *intestinorum dolore*, fructus illius usum esse noxium, nedum ut ex eo emolumentum ingens, ut speraverant, ad se rediret."

‡ H. Grotius existimat hic esse ἐν δια δυοῖν, et dici cherub et flammam gladii, ἀντί τοῦ cherub i. e. flammans gladius; flammeumque gladium interpretatur ignes ex bituminoso Babylonis agro accensos, per quos solos dabatur aditus in Paradisum, qui proinde Adamo eo pacto clausus erat. Crediderim potius hoc voluisse Mosen; deum, scilicet, angelos misisse, qui Babylonici aut similis agri bitumen accenderent, eoque quasi gladio flammeo ad arcendos homines uterentur."

One might feel tempted to believe that the author meant to make sport of the Bible, and by showing the absurdities of the literal historical sense, hint at the necessity of giving it up. And certainly, if this was not his conscious design, there was doubtless an obscure feeling of the kind at bottom. It is scarcely supposable that the few pretended marks of a later age, and the supposed historical contradictions, on which (in his *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande sur l'histoire critique du V. T.* p. Richard Simon, Amsterdam, 1685), he based his attack on the genuineness of the Pentateuch, and the retraction of which afterwards in his Commentary is not entirely free from suspicion, should themselves have had the power to determine him to a decision at that time so important. There must have been something else which gave importance to these grounds—for they alone could have made him but little difficulty. But be that as it may, this is certain, that after time had brought to light the necessary consequences of this mode of exposition, it was absurd to follow that mode and yet maintain the genuineness of the Pentateuch. The surprise was therefore perfectly reasonable, when Rosenmüller, who in his mode of exposition did not stand in the least above Clericus, nay transcribed him almost throughout, appeared all at once as the defender of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. For a fuller characterizing of our author, whose Commentary has had an influence equally extended and lasting, we will quote a few sentences from his treatise *de lingua Hebraica* (prefixed to his Commentary on Genesis). These show that standing on classic heathen ground, he looked far down upon the sacred writers; that these, whose glory is internal, had for him no form nor comeliness; that he was destitute even of Herder's tenderness of fancy which found means to reserve for the sacred writers at least a modest little place by the side of profane literature; that he had no conception of a peculiar standard by which the sacred writings should be judged, different even from that of oriental literature. P. VII: "In accordance with the genius of their language, they cultivated poetry somewhat more, and there are many things in their poetic compositions strongly and elegantly expressed; but from these you will see rather what they might have done if they had applied the study which other nations have devoted to this object, than that they actually attained to the praise of eloquence."* P. VIII: "They

* "Poeticen, pro linguae suae ingenio, paulo magis coluerunt, et

despise all rhetorical rules even such as do not depend on the varying tastes of men, but on fixed and universal principles. They want necessities, they abound in superfluities.”* P. IX: “Great regard to the order of time and events is not to be found among the Hebrews. Thus what is said of the division of the nations, Gen. x. ought to have been put after ch. 11: 9. In ch. 11: 3, 4, 8 there are transpositions in the narrative, as also in ch. 24: 23, etc. . . . A degrading of an object by a low figure ought to be avoided. Hence it is not proper to say, ‘The Lord is a man of war,’ ‘God has aroused like one sleeping, etc.’”† These censures do not, as Clericus pretends, apply only to the accidental *form* of the biblical phraseology, but to the form in its connection with the sense, and they show how unacquainted he was with this last, and how cold it left him.

After Clericus came *J. D. Michaelis*,‡ whose *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses* are here especially to be considered, although his ‘*Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte*’ (Annotations for the Unlearned) must also be noticed. His influence was even greater than that of his predecessor. The commentation of the latter was pretty generally regarded as that of a mere philologist, who was admitted as authority only in matters of his own department. Theological commentation looked down upon him, and continued its own way undisturbed; although it was incapable of bringing forth any thing important, and was thus unable to neutralize the influence of what was theological in Clericus’s expositions. The commentation of *J. D. Michaelis* on the contrary succeeded in obtaining almost universal author-

plurima in canticis eorum legantur graviter et ornate dicta; sed unde magis videas, quid facere potuissent, si studium quantum apud alias gentes adlatum est, adhibuissent, quam ad eloquentiae laudem pervenisse intelligas.”

* “Omnes Rhetorum canones, etiam eos, qui non ex variante hominum arbitrio pendent, sed certa et omnibus gentibus communi ratione nituntur, spernunt. . . . Necessarii carent et superfluis abundant.”

† “Ordinis temporis et rerum magna ratio ab Hebraeis non habetur. Sic, quae de divisione gentium habentur, Gen. c. 10, debent v. 9. c. 11. postponi. Cap. 11: 3, 4, 8 sunt quoque narrationis inversiones, ut et c. 24: 23, etc. . . . Fugienda est omnis turpitudine earum rerum, ad quas eorum animos, qui audiunt trahet similitudo. Per hanc canonem, dicere non licuisset, deum esse virum bellicosum, deum excitari quasi dormientem, etc.”

‡ Professor at Halle and Göttingen. Died 1791.

ity—so that his exegetical results may be considered as universally adopted at the time when the crisis came. Whatever raised itself against it was only laughed at, and that in part justly, as it showed all the weakness and helplessness of old age. It may be safely asserted that Michaelis, by removing the foundations on which the genuineness of the sacred books rest, did it more injury than those who afterward directly attacked it. He overthrew the substance, and then contended in vain against those who tried their strength upon the empty shell. His scope in the exposition of the Pentateuch is throughout an apologetic one. He aims, in opposition to the attacks of the English deists and of the French atheists, to show the excellence of the Mosaic law. But as he had no eye for its true excellence, he strips Moses of the praise which really belongs to him, and gives him another which he never sought, and which rather makes suspicious than establishes his character as an inspired lawgiver. “I will make bold to say,” says he in the beginning of his Commentaries, Part I. § 1, “that in the books of Moses are to be found some entirely unexpected and splendid instances of legislative wisdom.” To point out these instances is the great object of his work. Moses appears, if the results of this work are considered established, a man much like the Sir Knight Michaelis. That such a man should have had the aid of miracles and prophecies, is very improbable. Others who, though Moses be granted all the merit which Michaelis allows him, stood much higher as lawgivers than he, had no such aid. But since Michaelis’s time, there has been as much zeal to strip him of the imaginary merit of political cunning, as to refuse to restore that which really belongs to him. Remarkable in this respect is *Eichhorn’s* critique upon Michaelis, in the *Bibliothek für biblische Literatur*, Th. 3. S. 847: “In the industrious search after political plans and schemes, secret designs and projects are too unceremoniously ascribed to the lawgiver which he never thought of, or subtle political principles are made to connect laws which have a much looser connection. It is well that even Michaelis has perhaps with too full a hand, given too much:—we can now take away the easier. *The poor tent of Moses with its furniture is now before us; if any of this furniture is still too splendid, it can easily be exchanged for something of inferior quality.*” Michaelis’s political principles had not grown on christian soil: he had borrowed them from the ungodly politics of the age. French writers had been his

teachers. By ascribing now these principles without shame or reserve to Moses, he drew him down into a society where one would expect to find any body else sooner than a man of God. The assurance with which he does this, thinking that he is thereby doing a service to religion, must often excite a smile. The grossest thing of this kind is the assertion that Moses cherished the maxim, that the end sanctifies the means, and that so far, as sometimes to have used religion itself as a means to accomplish his purpose. He speaks on this point without the least reserve, in Part I. § 13: "In the legislative wisdom of Moses, I observe in general one stroke of policy, which is not commonly used in our days, and which perhaps is really no more capable of use. Many laws are made sacred by being placed in connection with virtue and religion, and having a religious signification or direction given to them, while their real causes and reasons are concealed. Such laws obtain thereby a degree of reverence, as the violation of them is regarded as a sin against virtue itself. . . . The few remains of the political wisdom of the Egyptians with which we are acquainted, show that they also often made use of this means. . . . When it could be done without deceit (!) Moses makes use of a similar policy." In the course of the work a great number of cases are brought forward, in which Moses is made to act upon this principle. So, e. g. Part 3. § 145: "When the observance of a certain law was very important, aid was sought from vows and religion. Thus did Moses against idolatry, the prohibition of which was one of the fundamental maxims of his government; and the Roman people did the same for the safety of their tribunes. It is manifest at once that this piece of political wisdom must not be used too freely, etc." He makes religion to be used as a means even for the lowest and most trivial objects. In the religious import given to the prescribed cleanliness of the camp (Num. 5: 1—3, etc.) Moses was, according to Michaelis, "not in earnest—his real object, which if it had been openly expressed, would not have been enough regarded, was, the prevention of foul smells.—Moses speaks as if he who seethed a kid in its mother's milk committed a sin against religion—the sagacious man designs nothing more by this than to induce the people to cook kids in *olive-oil* instead of *butter*, because they would taste better.—Among the ostensible reasons for forbidding the eating of fat and blood was this, that they belonged to the altar, and were too holy to be eaten—the real, concealed reason was, that

the eating of the fat parts and the use of fat in boiling, baking, and stewing, is injurious to a people subject to diseases of the skin, etc." See Part 4. § 171, 205, 206. This example of bad political maxims ascribed to Moses is indeed the grossest and most striking, but by no means the only one. There is another, running through the whole book, which is indeed more refined, but still, if established, calculated of itself to overthrow the belief of the divine mission of Moses, and thus that of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. Michaelis is at once an opposer of the divine right, and a defender of the unlimited power of government. Government is, according to him, a creature of the people—but then, as representative of the popular will, it is to have universal sway ; while every divine right is limited by him and confined to a certain sphere. This doctrine, originating in modern ungodliness, he also ascribes to Moses, and that to such an extent that the principle is made absurd and ridiculous. The lawgiver inspects the chambers and the pots. He takes such tender care of his subjects that he orders them to cook, not with butter but with oil, because it will taste better. "This," remarks Michaelis, Part 4. § 205, "will be called by many a German reader, *delicatesse*, over-done, *delicatesse*—but it might be of use to a people going to Palestine." Health is urged by the lawgiver upon his subjects by means truly heroic. Houses for example which are infected with leprosy, he commands, through concern for the health of the inhabitant, to be pulled down. For delicate nerves he shows the most tender care:—the leprous person must not dwell in the camp, must cover his face, etc., lest he should excite one's disgust by his really hateful appearance, or, frighten him by an unexpected touch. Such tenderness of police would be cruelty even to those for whose sake at the expense of others it was enforced. Who would not have his disgust excited or suffer a little fright for once, rather than feel the hand of the police always on his neck ?

Michaelis shows every where the most anxious dread of forsaking the ground which he holds in common with his opponents—not because he fears they would not follow him to another, but because—and this is his strongest reason—he himself feels nowhere else at home. Hence, in regard to every thing in the law which can be defended only by reasons felt by one of deep religious feeling, he prepared the way for an easy triumph to his opposers. For all the acuteness which he manifested

could not long conceal the weakness of the defence which he had made upon the ground of mere natural causes, and that the *supernatural* ground was not defensible, was now, after this concession of the very leader of supernaturalism, considered as established. Thus in part I. § 65, the sentiment that when God says, Ex. 34: 24, that during the absence of the Hebrews at their yearly feasts at Jerusalem, no one should desire their land, he pledges himself to reward fidelity on their part with fidelity on his, Michaelis sets aside by a remark too gross even for those who believe in a Providence as little as the Deists do. "Will we dare," says he, "to explain the words of Moses so as to make him promise a periodical miracle on the part of God, viz. that for three weeks in every year, all the enemies of the Israelites should be turned into blocks?" One might here almost conceive himself listening to the knight (lord) in 2 Kings vii.* Moses, in this passage, according to Michaelis, enjoins upon the people to trust in a principle of international law which he pretends was observed at that time, by which one nation respected the religious rites of the other, and suspended hostilities while a feast was celebrating. Thus he remarks in reference to the Sabbatical year, which, notwithstanding its religious exterior, had no other object according to him than to lead the people always to keep a provision of grain, "Can God have pledged himself to work such a periodical miracle (the double crop in the sixth year) which would have been, besides, entirely unnecessary if Moses had not made such a ruinous law?" What crude views of the common course of nature lie at the bottom of such remarks! How inconsistent, that he who is so impotent to see the hand of God in *nature*, will yet in part maintain its agency in *history*! Thus he denies the *divine right* of the Israelites to Palestine, and labors in vain, with all the art of a special pleader, to prove their *human* right to it. Of the essence of the theocracy he has no conception. That in which alone he finds it, viz. the decision by Urim and Thummim, the presence of the cloud, etc., belonged for the most part only to the Mosaic times, and appears, in its isolation, so singular, so *ex abrupto*, that it was immediately lost as soon as the mythical interpretation laid its hand upon it. The theocracy was "quoted in its main design only a name, a designation,

* "Behold, if the Lord would make windows in heaven, might this thing be?"

which might the easier keep out idolatry." Part I. § 35. On Ex. 19: 6, where the Israelites are called a kingdom of priests, he remarks, "This mode of speaking appears to have come from Egypt, where the priests had great privileges, owned their own lands tax-free, and were besides supported by the king." How can he who has so little conception of the Israelites as God's people, have any just conception of the God who really dwelt among them. The difference between the Old Testament religion and heathenism, is, as he understands it, the most superficial possible—that of Monotheism and Polytheism. The grand object of the law is according to him the *negative* one, the prevention of idolatry:—the *positive* design, that of producing a living practical religious feeling, he entirely loses sight of. With such a low view of religion, it is therefore very natural that he should feel dislike when it advances any claims. Thus, in his additions to his Commentaries, in *Ammon und Bertholdt's Journal*, Th. 4. S. 356, he shows that some of Abraham's servants must have been circumcised before, because otherwise (at the first circumcision) all work must have been suspended for eight days, and the cattle could not have been fed. He thus zealously labors to find out for all severe and burdensome ceremonies, dietetical, medicinal, municipal and other objects, in order to show that while the Levites did not as servants of religion earn the revenue they enjoyed, yet that as physicians, surveyors, and learned men they well deserved it.

It is remarkable that Michaelis, thus standing as he did on the ground of mere natural causes in explaining the biblical history, yet left the miracles of the Pentateuch generally untouched, and sought an explanation from natural causes only where Clericus had done so before him. See especially Ex. xiv. This however is easily accounted for from the fact that in this respect he departed less from the older views than in most others. Had he departed here also, he must have denied the miracles and the genuineness of the Pentateuch altogether; and this, on account of education, and perhaps a remnant of early pious feeling, he could not do. Also the spirit of the age, at the time that he was in the vigor of his faculties, had still its influence over him.

Historical Skepticism.

But however close may have been the connection between the degenerate exegesis we have just described, and the denial of

the genuineness of the Pentateuch, yet there must have been some powerful causes in the last quarter of the last century, to have produced the transition from the former to the latter just at that time—a transition which from that time became more and more predominant. Without some such causes, either this dangerous but natural step would have been prevented by the mere power of orthodox habit, or a reaction would have taken place in exegesis itself. The very degeneration of exegesis shows the existence of such causes—causes which had been long silently preparing. For if that degeneration was not merely accidental—if it had its origin in the continually extending spirit of the times—a spirit which formed itself more and more into a conscious hostility to what was old, then the denial of the genuineness must not be regarded simply as a consequence of the perversion of exegesis, but is to be derived immediately from the spirit of the age itself.

The preceding ages had had a great reverence for the past, and so, for all historical accounts. This reverence was for the most part, the result of humility. To be hostile to the past, was, they believed, to be enemies to themselves. They did not wish to be cast entirely upon themselves. But here also, as always, that which was in principle good, was abused and carried to extremes. Although individuals were by no means wanting who practised historical criticism with unprejudiced minds, yet there was in general a too extravagant respect for every thing that gave itself out for history. There was a dread of beginning the work of historical criticism through a secret fear of the end to which it might lead.

In the latter part of the seventeenth century this reverence for history began gradually to disappear; at first in England, Holland and France (it is sufficient to mention the names of *Bayle* and *Harduin*), and then, after the accession of Frederick II. to the throne, also in Germany, where the love of contradiction, once worked up by that spirit of investigation which is peculiar to the nation, put on a very dangerous shape. The higher the age, in proud self-importance, regarded itself as standing above those that were past, so much the more did it feel itself allowed to do as it pleased with their monuments. It thought that at any rate there was little to lose by doing so. Its opinion of its own strength rose higher when it had succeeded in overthrowing that on which the blinded past had rested. A cry of triumph was raised, whenever an old structure fell to the

ground. In addition to this, the proud temper of the age lost more and more the spirit of love, which enables one to open himself to what is good in others, and thus improves the power of the understanding. What was not understood it was considered perfectly right to reject.

This universal *change in the position of the times in regard to history* must not be passed over when we are investigating the causes of the change in their position in regard to the sacred books and especially the Pentateuch. How every thing of a special character rests here upon something general, how the attacks on Homer for instance had in one point of view the same origin as those against the biblical books, has been already shown by others. Thus *Schubarth* remarks (*Ideen ueber Homer und sein Zeitalter*, S. 236): "Since the middle of the last century there has prevailed a young and vigorous spirit, which has led men to believe that the human mind is able to draw all its nutriment and sustenance from itself. Of course the productions of past ages, which had till now been the only resort for counsel, light, culture and edification, lost at once much of their former estimation and importance. There appeared more and more an active, bold, rash, nay insolent spirit of contradiction against the past. And accordingly we see that after men had endeavored to rid themselves of a burdensome restraint in regard to the Bible, the same spirit of disruption spread itself upon every thing received from former ages, with the effort rather to throw it off altogether, than to ascertain and defend its true worth and importance.

Still the general explanation is altogether insufficient to account for the course of opinions in regard to the Pentateuch. It can, considering the strong proofs of genuineness, account at most only for the denial of that genuineness by individuals, and as a temporary thing—not for the obstinacy with which this denial has been maintained, and the wide prevalence it has found. In profane literature, the period of this levity of skepticism came soon to an end; and if single cases of it now still appear, and show that this perverse spirit has not yet wholly died out, yet it exists only in individuals, and can never again become general. External proofs are granted more of their just weight, and there is less levity in handling the internal. There is some effort to understand before condemning. Where there is no stronger motive, there pride at least urges, by way of change, to build up again that which pride had pulled down. Every (ancient) wri-

ter who had unjustly lost what belonged to him is in process of being restored in due time *in integrum*. The turn which the investigations on Homer have of late taken, is known. Even those who still continue to doubt differ materially from their predecessors. Where these saw nothing but confusion and chance, there their followers discover profound unity and organic connection—very different from what is the case in regard to the Pentateuch, where the absurd assertion of a fragmentary compilation is continually repeated. The orations of Cicero which were rejected by *Wolf* are again acknowledged to be genuine. *Socher's* rash judgment on some dialogues of Plato was received with dissatisfaction, and even the rejection of some smaller and less important ones by *Ast*, is now admitted to have been too strong. Instead of rejecting them at once and entirely upon the assertion of their external spuriousness, men are satisfied that they are immature products of the Platonic spirit. See *Richter, Geschichte d. Philosophie*, Th. 2. S. 170 ff. and *Ackermann, Das Christliche im Plato*, S. 21. The eighth book of Thucydides was denied to be his, on account of its differing from the rest in mode of representation. *Niebuhr* regards this inference as a cutting of the knot, as stupid capriciousness. "I think I see," says he, in his *klein Schriften*, Th. I. S. 409, "in this very difference, this great master's just sense of propriety:—that as the solemnity and dignity of the style rise higher and higher until the catastrophe in Sicily, so after the importance of the events ceases, the narration itself assumes another tone. An inferior writer would have thought it necessary to maintain the same pathos to the end. For the history of events toward the end of the war, Thucydides would have returned to his loftiness of style. But the period of long distress and torture during the undecided contest required a simpler narrative." How much more obvious than this is the reason of the difference of manner between Deuteronomy and the other books of the Pentateuch—how much less tact of observation is necessary in order to discover it than *Niebuhr* here shows. It occurs of itself to every unprejudiced mind; and that it is nevertheless so disdainfully rejected, that we constantly hear the assertion, the difference of style proves unanswerably a different author, shows very manifestly that here interests come into play from the influence of which profane literature is free. When we consider the universal disapprobation with which even a moderate tendency to historical skepticism was regarded even in

men of such standing as O. Müller, we think we may confidently assert that if such ridiculously arbitrary criticism as that of De Wette had been directed to disprove the genuineness of a profane writer or against any part of profane history, it would be already forgotten, and would have only served to obtain for its author the sorry celebrity of a Harduin. But even if De Wette excited some attention at first, a book like that of *Vatke** would, if he had chosen to employ his acuteness on Herodotus for instance, instead of the Pentateuch, have been carried immediately from the womb to the grave. It would have been looked upon as lying beyond the limits of the field of science.

How little the universal tendency of the age to historical skepticism can satisfactorily explain our problem, is seen from the fact, that many who decidedly deny the genuineness of the Pentateuch, and the credibility of what it contains, show in other cases an utter want of historical criticism, and are more ready to admit the genuineness and credibility of ancient writings than any inquirer of note in earlier times. The same Volney for example who with true Voltaire-audacity, denies all historic foundation for the Pentateuch, who heads the fourteenth chapter of his '*Recherches sur l'histoire ancienne*,' with '*du personnage appelé Abraham*' (concerning the personage called Abraham,) appeals as to an unexceptionable witness to *Sanchoniathon*, whose false pretensions to antiquity even the criticism of the unenlightened times had long before exposed, and uses him as a *lapis Lydius* by which to try the pretensions of others. "Let us hear (says he, t. i. p. 166, Brussels,) Sanchoniathon, who wrote about 1300 years before the Christian era." Late writers such as *Nicol. Damascenus*, *Alex. Polyhistor*, and *Artapanus*, whose accounts on these matters are evidently only the echo of Jewish tradition, and who have therefore no independent weight as historians, are according to him important in the highest degree, and capable of affording weapons against the truth of the sacred history. And it is not a mere accident, that that very German critic who has succeeded best in concealing the theological bias which influences him, and who could therefore venture with a good hope of producing effect, to designate as *naïf* the charge of doctrinal predilections—that *Ge-*

* *Vatke* is professor at Berlin—a colleague of Hengstenberg and professes to be a follower of Schleiermacher. See an extended critique on his '*Biblische Theologie*,' *infra*, p. 24 seq.—Tr.

senius has had to show before the eyes of all Europe how easy it would be for him to acknowledge the genuineness of the Pentateuch, if the matter were to be decided simply in the forum of historical conscience. He first ran into the trap of a French marquis, who for the sake of sport gave out an inscription fabricated by himself as a relique of great antiquity. Gesenius acknowledged it as an important monument for the history of Gnosticism, and commented on it in his essay '*de inscriptione nuper in Cyrenaica reperta*,' (on the inscription lately found in Cyrene.) Scarcely had he got over the smart which the confession of his error, now no longer to be deferred after the exposure of the fraud by Böckh, Kopp and others, must have caused him—scarcely prepared himself to cover this error in oblivion by important publications on paleography, than he fell into a far worse difficulty. What had happened to him before in regard to a few lines, occurred again with a whole book. What a wide distance between the youthful Dr. of medicine Wagenfeld, and the ancient Sanchoniathon! If it was a *salto mortale* from Wagenfeld to Philo, how much more from Wagenfeld to Sanchoniathon!*

Judgment of late Historians.

Another important proof that the solution of the problem (why the genuineness of the Pentateuch has been so universally denied) must be sought elsewhere than on ground common to all branches of literature is the fact, *that the judgment of late historians and of other learned men not theologians in regard to the Pentateuch differs so essentially from that of theologians*; a phenomenon which can be explained only in this way, that the theologian shuts his eyes to every thing until he finds how it stands in relation to his preconceived opinions, and in accordance with the result he obtains here, decides upon the former question; while the historian, although he may share the same opinions, is yet not so much influenced by them as to be induced to violate his historical conscience and turn traitor to history. This matter is so important that we shall be justified in taking time to illustrate it by a few examples. That the Pentateuch would even now regain universal acknowledgement

* Dr. Wagenfeld of Bremen pretended to have discovered a Greek Manuscript of the work of Philo Byblius the pretended translator of Sanchoniathon. See *infra*, p. 34, note 1.—Ta.

as the work of Moses if it had to do only with historical criticism, and had only to pass through the ordeal of the universal tendency to historical skepticism, is made the plainer by the facts about to be quoted, when we remember that this is one of the subjects on which the historians are most dependent upon the theologians, on account of their want of the knowledge of the necessary languages, and the vast extent of the field which they have to occupy; and which therefore the theologians have tried every way to confuse and darken for them. It must be remembered too, that the historians are also, as we shall hereafter show, always under a certain influence of the theological principles of the times. If then, under such disadvantages, historians still regard the Pentateuch as authentic history, the fact is so much the more important.

Heeren's position in regard to the Pentateuch deserves first to be attended to. He has, it is manifest, designedly avoided expressing himself decisively and fully on this subject. But this very avoiding of the subject is a plain proof of his want of confidence in the investigations of the theologians. Without permitting himself to be deceived with their confident air, he will first see what issue the matter comes to. So far as the cause of the accused comes under *his* cognition he finds no fault in him. The loud '*crucify*,' of theologians does not deceive him. Also, there is not in all his works, one doubt expressed in regard to any historical statement of the Pentateuch. When he quotes it, especially in that volume of his *Ideen* which treats of Egypt, he uses it without qualification as a source worthy of confidence. The principal facts of the Pentateuch are acknowledged by him to be historically established in his *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 4te Aufl. S. 40. In the same book S. 58 (p. 51 of the English translation) he remarks that the accounts of Moses, although they give no continuous history, yet give a true picture of Egypt in his time. He mentions as a subject for further oral explanation (to his classes) 'importance and excellencies of the Jewish accounts so far as they are purely historical.' Particularly important however is a remark of Heeren made very lately in a notice of a new volume of Rossellini's work on Egypt, in the *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1835, S. 1328. "We cannot close this notice without expressing the wish that some learned orientalist would subject to a critical and impartial examination the chapter contained in pp. 254—270 of this work, and the drawing in the Atlas belonging thereto, *monumenti*

civili, No. 49; representing the making of bricks. *If this monumental device is a representation of the enslaved children of Israel at their labors, it is a relique equally important for exegesis and for chronology.* For exegesis, because it would be a striking proof of the high antiquity of the Mosaic writings and especially for the book of Exodus, the description in which, chs. 1, and 5, this monument most faithfully exhibits and illustrates, even down to subordinate matters. For chronology, because it belongs to the time of the eighteenth dynasty, and the reign of Thutmes-Moeris, about 1740 years before Christ, and would give fixed points and landmarks both for sacred and profane history. According to the inscriptions which stand as usual above the figures, it is the monument of an inspector of the royal edifices, of the name of Roscéré." How manifold must the proof of the genuineness of the Pentateuch have before been to one who gives a hearing to this new witness but just out of his grave—a witness whom the theologian would at once have given a rap on the mouth—like the negro, who, when one supposed to be dead raised himself up in his coffin, immediately pushed him back again, exclaiming, 'I have it in black and white that you are dead.'

After Heeren let us hear *Johannes V. Müller*. He has always been consistent with himself in admitting the genuineness of the Pentateuch. He maintained it even before his religious principles had become fixed. The historian had preceded the Christian in this conviction. He is open to internal proofs of genuineness; and if such exist, he knows how to set aside whatever else may appear to contradict them. Thus in his *Allg. Geschichte*, 3te Aufl. Th. I. S. 444, he says, "Every trait of the first book (Genesis) has relation to a state of things and to objects which accord only with Moses. When he makes mention of the head of his own race he shows the boldness of truth. The whole air and manner is peculiar to him. Even trivialities prove the genuineness. But it was the custom in the most ancient times, passing over details, to represent the more important occurrences in lofty terms as the will and work of the great first cause; because the practical spirit and object of the narrators, filling their souls with an earnest solemnity, led them, unincumbered with theoretic technicalities, to urge upon their fellow-men dependence upon their Sovereign-Ruler and obedience to his ordinances as expressed to us in nature." Theologians see in the ceremonial law a monument of refined priestcraft, a

system of external religious rules, which originated in an age when the spirit of religion was unknown. See for example *De Wette*, Krit. S. 270 ff. To Müller it appears as entirely worthy of one sent of God, as perfectly according with the spirit of Moses, and with the character of his age. "He consecrated," says he, S. 441, "a great symbol, consisting entirely of ceremonies; so that while the simple fundamental law contained nothing but what their fathers had believed, with the addition of a few admonitions, the ritual law gave the people continual employment in rites which engaged the senses. There is a tradition the truth of which is made probable by some remaining vestiges, that Moses explained the meaning of these usages, and that these explanations were preserved among the elders: yet he might foresee that their substantial meaning would not, even without such explanation, escape men of understanding. In other places also he puts aside with little pains rocks of offence which theologians had cast in the way. "The repetitions," says he in his *Anmerkungen zu den Büchern Moses* (Remarks on the books of Moses) in the Appendix to the *Blicken in die Bibel* by his brother J. G. Müller 2ter Band, Winterth. 1830, S. 476, "the repetitions are in the spirit of those ancient times." Also, (ibid. S. 476,) "As soon as we think of the greatness of the object, no repetition is tedious—every thing shows what it is for." On the genealogies and list of nations in Gen. 10, to maintain still the historical character of which, is held by theologians, to be a ridiculous anachronism, he, the historian, who is not, like them, so credulous as to receive at once every new discovery as true, nor like them so unscientific as to regard facile etymologies as sufficient data for constructing histories and for overthrowing them, he says (ibid. S. 458), "The data are geographically entirely true. From this chapter universal history ought to begin." These *Remarks* show also that his opinion as to the genuineness of the Pentateuch, cannot be explained as a prejudice originating in accident and maintained by ignorance, but that it is the result of fundamental and persevering study. If the Pentateuch has in fact such pitiful historical pretensions as theologians assert, then Johannes Von Müller must be struck out of the list of our great historians.

Neither does *Luden* show any great desire to accept of these 'Grecian presents' without examination. He shows without disguise that the Pentateuch makes upon him a very different

impression from what it does upon the theologians. And though he does not venture to take ground in decided and entire opposition to them, yet he very carefully avoids making any decided concessions ; thinking that the matter may easily take another turn, and then his admissions would only cause him regret. In his *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 2te Aufl. Jena, 1819, S. 60, he remarks, "If it is considered how and when those writings probably originated, and if the relation is never forgotten in which the Israelites supposed themselves to stand towards Jehovah, and that they relate their fortunes always in accordance with that relation, then to be sure some of the details may be matter of doubt, but on the whole the course of events is truly given us." Id. S. 61 : "Their great increase in Egypt in the course of more than four hundred years is in accordance with nature ; the severe oppression which they were finally called to suffer is very conceivable ; and still more conceivable their longing after the never forgotten native land." Id. S. 62 : "The forty years residence in the wilderness was a wise measure ; and exhibits Moses in all his greatness." Id. S. 63 : "The law which God gave to Israel through Moses from time to time, under awful and terrible circumstances, is remarkable in the highest degree, and deserves profound investigation, not only *because it is the oldest*, or because it is distinguished by its great general principles, but also, and especially, because in it foreign (Egyptian) regulations are adapted with such wisdom to the manners and national character of the Israelites." Id. S. 64 : "But forty years in the wilderness with signs and wonders had not succeeded in training up and making holy to the Lord that degraded and stiff-necked people. The sublime songs of Moses did not secure devotion to Jehovah. The record of his miraculous providence in regard to them—the *oldest monument of written history*—held not the people in fidelity toward God."

Wachler in his *Handbuch der Geschichte der Literatur* (Manual of History of Literature), 2te Ausgabe, Th. I. S. 78, thus speaks : "Moses the author of the Hebrew constitution, was, as lawgiver, poet and historian, a model for after generations. The five books which bear his name are, with the exception of some small additions, of the greatest antiquity, and belong to the times of his glorious administration. They contain views on divine and human things—political reflections—clear views into futurity—and the gushings forth of deep feel-

ing." Id. S. 79: "The oldest poetry of the Hebrews was epic, and celebrated the creation of the world and the first history of the human race with immediate reference to their national history. It received its form from Moses, who also gave the first model for lyric poetry.

Schlosser in his translation of the Universal History, 1. 1. S. 237, expresses himself as follows: "This (the composition of the greatest part of the Pentateuch by Moses) was so much the more probable and natural, as Moses had been educated in Egypt, where all transactions, even civil processes, were in writing, as he found characters for the sounds of his own language already among the Phenicians, and he himself instituted a numerous class of writers in the country, who were partly employed in the police, and partly in order to prevent controversies about the boundaries of lands, had to keep the genealogies, and record important changes."

Leo had formerly, in his *Vorlesungen über Jüdische Geschichte* (Lectures on Jewish History) submitted himself fully to the authority of the theologians, and was quoted by them with great triumph as one of their party. They had, indeed, reason to triumph, as he was in fact the first historian of any importance whom they had been able to allure into their snare. But *Leo* began afterwards to see more and more with his own eyes, and found that while he had been zealously searching out the traces of a pretended great priest-cabal in Israel, he had himself been taken in the net of a real priest-cabal in Germany, and at last openly renounced his obedience, and returned back to the sphere of history. In his *Lehrbuch d. Universalgeschichte* (Text-book of Universal History), Bd. I. Halle, 1835, S. 570, he thus speaks of the Pentateuch: "We have then, after examining what has recently been written on this subject, come to the decided conviction, that the essential parts of the law, as well as a great portion of the historical accounts, which form the groundwork of the Pentateuch, and cannot be entirely separated from the laws, as they show their import and design, were written by Moses himself; and that the gathering of the whole into one *corpus*, if not done by Moses himself, certainly took place soon after his time, perhaps during his life, and under his own eye:—and that the obtaining of a different result from the critical investigations made on this subject, and which certainly in point of learning are very valuable, has its cause simply in the fact that men have not sufficiently distinguished

between the East and the West, and between the infantile character of that ancient age with its phenomena and circumstances, and these modern times which by refined reflection and hyper-wisdom have got beyond all the natural modes of judging and acting."

Von Rotteck has surrendered himself so entirely to the spirit of the times from which the theologians have received their prejudices against the Pentateuch, that we could not wonder if we saw these prejudices in him in their greatest extent. And still this is not the case. Between him and *De Wette* for example, there still remains a great difference. In his review of the sources of history for the first period, *Allgem. Geschichte* (Universal History), Th. I. 11te Aufl. Freib. 1835, S. 57, he remarks: "It cannot be denied that the narratives contained in the first book of Moses are distinguished above all these worthless accounts (on the origin of the earth and of man—by Sanchoniathon, Zoroaster, and in general all Oriental, Chinese, Thibetan, and Indian accounts and also those of Grecian historians and philosophers) as well by a mode of statement more agreeable to reason and the eternal laws of nature, as by their having come down to us uncorrupted; and therefore these Mosaic documents, which there is besides good ground for regarding as the oldest in the world, will always obtain approbation and respect even before the bar of a criticism purely scientific and having no reference to religious views. . . . The same judgment is to be pronounced in regard to the original history of man. Here also the Mosaic accounts have such a manifest superiority over those of all the so-called profane writers, that we cannot deny them, at least comparatively, a high degree of probability." In his review of sources for the history of the Hebrews, S. 73, he says: "For the history of no other people of this period do we possess so ancient, so circumstantial and such credible accounts. The above-quoted biblical writers were (leaving inspiration out of view) for the most part eye-witnesses and participators in the events recorded, or else were in a situation which enabled them to collect and compare original documents and traditions in regard to former national events. These traditions go back to the very cradle, to the very first origin of the Hebrew nation, and so far as regards the great chain of events, their credibility cannot be denied—for as to the attendant circumstances and what is perhaps only figurative representation, the case is different."

Of all the historians of the latest times who are really important, or are so regarded, there is left for the opposers of the Pentateuch not a single one. They have to satisfy themselves with people like *Mannert*, who in his *Handbuch d. alten Geschichte* (Manual of Ancient History), Berlin, 1818, already forgotten, or which rather came dead into the world, does to be sure talk in their style. It is sufficient, in order to characterize him, to quote such passages as follows: S. 12, "The superiority of man to brutes consists only in his fingers, his erect form, and language. The elements of reason are possessed also by 'other animals;'" and S. 6, where a tremendous blow is levelled against the flood in these words: "The thought at once arises, how could a righteous God destroy the innocent brutes because guilty men had broken his laws?" The good man ought certainly to abstain from eating flesh; nay, the slaying of beasts is in this view a kind of fratricide, and the eating of them a Thyestian feast. Men of this way of thinking are worthy of no notice even were they more gifted than the one before us. Where all sense for that which is high and noble is wanting, and where there is a real hatred for that which is divine, there one's historical conscience is of no more avail on the subject of the sacred history, and the historian becomes the bad theologian. Neither would we acknowledge the philosophizing historian as competent in this field. Were history sold into the service of some philosophical system, as e. g. the Hegelian, then indeed the case might occur of a friendly agreement between the historian and the pseudo-theologian. For as the latter, so the former of these, does not examine the materials before him with tender conscientiousness, indifferent what kind of results he arrives at; but he is only concerned to make his materials coincide with his predetermined views; and these, in the case of the new philosophical systems now in vogue, do not admit of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But until this bargain is completed, such a coincidence can never be certain. *Ranke's* History of the Popes is a pledge that for history better times are coming.

We add to all this that with the most important historians of the latest times, is associated also *the most distinguished chronologist*. *Ideler*, in his *Handbuch des Chronologie* (Manual of Chronology), Berlin, 1825, not only takes for granted throughout the Mosaic origin of the law, but also expressly declares it. So, for example, Th. I. S. 479: "During their for-

ty years' wandering through the stony and desert Arabia, their leader gave them a constitution which was not to be put fully into operation until they had entered the promised Canaan, the original country of their nomadic ancestors. This constitution had for its sole design to make them an agricultural people. This is shown by their calendar, by which the observance of their prescribed feast days and their sabbaths was regulated." The chronologist tries the genuineness of the book especially in reference, as is proper, to his own science; and as he finds all right here, and just as it would have been, had the book been genuine (compare e. g. S. 508), he leaves unregarded the loud exclamations of the theologians.

[To be continued.]*

ARTICLE V.

WHAT WERE THE VIEWS ENTERTAINED BY THE EARLY REFORMERS, ON THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION, FAITH, AND THE ACTIVE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST?

By the Rev. R. W. Landis, Jeffersonville, Pa.

"Incidere in falsae opinionis errorem, priusquam vera cognoscas, imperiti animi est et simplicis: perseverare vero in eo, postquam agnoveris, contumaciae."—*Vide Salviani Epist. ad Aprum et Verum.*

Introduction.

In itself considered, the views entertained on these subjects by the venerable men referred to, is a matter of minor importance. They were men like ourselves, and liable to err. But

* The author in the remaining part of this Article attributes the origin of the denial of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, by the theologians of Germany, to the prevalence of *Naturalism—Pantheism*,—the fashionable opinions of sin and holiness—Aversion to the leading personages of the Pentateuch—Incapacity of entering into the spirit of it, and the stagnation of fundamental study. The discussion is interesting and instructive, and we regret the necessity of deferring it to a future No. of the Repository.—Ed.

the question assumes importance from the fact that, by most, if not all, in the present age, who embrace the system of doctrine called Calvinism, it is tacitly admitted, and that by those who profess a rigid adherence to that system, it is earnestly contended that the views of the early Reformers on the subjects embraced in the foregoing question, were strictly in accordance with truth. The doctrine of *justification by faith*, has ever been regarded as the "distinctive doctrine of the Reformation;" and however erroneous the views of the reformers may have been on other points of theology, all true Calvinists agree that on *this point* they were substantially correct. It is this doctrine which Luther has so finely denominated the "*Articulus vel stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*."

But intimately interwoven with their conceptions of this doctrine were, of necessity, their views of faith, and of the obedience of Christ. We must, therefore, be fully possessed of their belief on these topics, or we cannot have a distinct understanding of their views of the doctrine of justification by faith. Hence, although it was primarily our intention to treat in this Article, on the subject of justification only, we have judged it important to accompany our examination of that doctrine, with a view of the other points referred to.

The bearing which a consideration of these topics must have upon some of the agitating controversies of the times, will be apparent to many. It is, however, foreign from the intention of the writer to mingle in these controversies. It is his desire to treat this subject not as a controvertist, but as near as may be, with the calm impartiality of a historian. In illustration of the positions which he may attempt to establish, he will simply refer to plain, undeniable matters of fact. If in any instance he should deviate from this rule, it will be from the infirmity to which he is subject in common with his fellow men. He wishes not to descend to disputation. The tears and the blood of a lacerated Zion, already sufficiently proclaim, that in the controversies which have been, and which still exist, the elements of human imperfection have been too largely blended.

It is, however, to be lamented, that in the controversies referred to, there have been manifested much confusion of views and not a little want of information respecting the real teachings of Calvin and the other reformers. Some, who profess to be the strict and uncompromising disciples of these venerable men, and who have perseveringly urged the discipline of the church

against those who differ from them in their views on the topics in question, have themselves advanced positions, as essential to Calvinism, which it has appeared to the writer were never maintained by Calvin, or the reformers of his time: and have also censured others as heretical for maintaining positions which are precisely those which Calvin and his associates defended as the doctrines of the reformation.*

* To illustrate these positions fully, before we proceed to establish them, we beg leave to refer to one of the cases which has been for years agitating the Presbyterian church in America. It may be compendiously stated as follows: The Rev. George Junkin, D. D., president of the Lafayette College in Easton, Pa., tabled a series of charges against the Rev. Albert Barnes of Philadelphia; the *tenth* of which series is the following: "*Mr. Barnes teaches in opposition to the standards, that justification is simply pardon.*" Dr. Junkin endeavors to establish this charge by a number of quotations from a work of Mr. Barnes entitled "*Notes on Romans*:" after which he sums up the evidence as follows: "Now that Mr. Barnes makes the whole of justification consist in pardon, forgiveness, remission of sins, is just as true as the assertion I made in the ninth charge. For if he rejects, as I suppose is proved, the active obedience of Christ, of course there is nothing left but pardon. But let us attend to the other proofs in order. 1. He makes acquitting them from punishment and admitting them to favor, as equivalent to justification. He makes the word to justify, to mean '*to treat as if innocent, to regard as innocent, to pardon, to forgive.*' This is the charge in terms. 2. He denies that the righteousness becomes ours, but that it is God's plan for pardoning sin. 3. Again, '*pardon or justification*' are synonymes. '*Righteous, justified, free from condemnation,*' equally explicit, etc." See "*Vindication*" by Dr. Junkin, p. 132, 133. The principles advanced in this work of Dr. Junkin have received the decided approbation of many others in the church of which he is a minister.

To the foregoing allegations Mr. Barnes thus replies: "I have not taught what is here charged upon me, but the very reverse. So far from teaching that justification is merely pardon, I have, in the very passages under consideration taught that God regards and treats the sinner who believes in Christ as if he was righteous, and that solely on account of the merits of Christ, irrespective of any good deeds or desert of the sinner, whatsoever.—It is true that pardon, in the divine arrangement implies justification as certainly to exist. But it is because God has so arranged it; and not because pardon is the same thing as justification." See "*Defence*," p. 261—262.

This case which we have thus presented, will serve to show the necessity that exists for a thorough investigation of this subject; especially, if there be a probability of its being attended with but the partial restoration and promotion of confidence among brethren.

Having long believed that the present state of the church of Christ imperiously calls for an investigation of this subject, the writer of this Article has been for a number of years bestowing upon it what attention he was able. He has sought to acquaint himself thoroughly with the system of Calvinism as it came from the hands of the reformers who flourished during the first century of the reformation; that is, before the period arrived, when protestants, beginning to attend more to the points on which they differed, than to those on which they agreed, eventually proceeded in introducing into the church the agitating and withering storms of interminable controversy. So early as A. D. 1625, we find the venerable *Abraham Scultetus* bewailing such a state of things as follows: *At nostra juvenus*, etc., "Even our young men have at length got to paying more attention to human writings, than to those which are divine. They adopt in relation to them the Horatian precept: *Read them by day, and study them by night*. They are more learned in the definitions of men than in those of the word of life. Not like Apollos, powerful in the Scriptures; but they excel in that knowledge which is the greatest curse to the church. For the sake of disputation they neglect sermonizing, disregard the study of language, and never seriously think of investigating the genuine sense of the Scriptures. They do not bring forth the sense of the text, nor expound it to their hearers, nor show them how it may be applied for consolation and instruction. They make themselves ridiculous with the learned, while before the poor and ignorant they dispute in the jargon of the schools; or announce that for the word of God, which is not in the word of God." The existence of such a state of things at so early a date will sufficiently justify our selection of the first century of the Reformation as the purest; and as the period best calculated to make known the doctrines of the reformers unencumbered with useless scholastic distinctions. To Calvinism as it came from the hands of the reformers of that period, the writer is prepared to subscribe, with but little modification;*

* The modification referred to, relates principally to the extent to which they carried out their views of the purposes of God. It cannot be denied that in the general, (nor do I now recollect one instance of distinct disavowal,) they asserted the reprobation of infants *dying in infancy*. Vide e. g. *Calvin*, Instit. Lib. II. c. 1. § 6, and Lib. III. c. 23. § 7, and Lib. IV. c. 15. § 10, and *Piscator*, Append. ad Tract. de Grat. Dei, *Joh. Scharpius*, De Reprobatione, Par. II. Arg. XI., 75.

and he has undertaken the laborious course of study referred to because it appeared to be the only satisfactory method left of ascertaining what are the essential doctrines of the system. He has satisfied himself; and having compared the system with the word of God, he is prepared to meet with cheerfulness whatever consequences may result from adopting for his text-book, the "*Institutes*" of the illustrious Calvin.

The doctrine of justification by faith, as we have already intimated, has ever been regarded by protestants as the great and distinctive doctrine of the Reformation. And if there be a doctrine on which the followers of Calvin and Luther in the present day, will unhesitatingly, concede that the views of the primitive reformers were sound—*this is the doctrine*. It was at the peril of their lives that they rescued this pillar in the temple of God's eternal truth from the rubbish which impious hands had been heaping upon it for ages. And while it is true that persons who have to a limited extent departed from their views of this doctrine, *may* still be regarded as sound, in the general, *it must yet be admitted that those who entertain on this subject the views which they entertained cannot be regarded by Calvinists as unsound*. To this last canon all their professed followers will readily subscribe.

The topics which will form the subject of the present investigation it is our intention to take up and consider in the order of their announcement in the question at the head of this article. We shall therefore commence with the doctrine of justification.

lenus, Syntag. De Predestinatione, Dr. Francis Gomar, Opp. Tom. II. p. 279, Dr. Amandus Polanus, Syntag. Lib. IV. c. 10. Thes. II. and IV., Dr. Twisse of England, etc. Their method of treating the subject shows that the principle was extensively, if not universally acknowledged amongst them. We extract an instance from one of the last named divines, for the classical reader. Dr. Polanus is treating upon the efficient cause of reprobation; and he thus speaks: "*Si decreti reprobationis causa efficiens est peccatum tum aut originale erit aut actuale. At originale peccatum decreti reprobationis causa non est, quia sic omnes homines naturaliter nascentes reprobatii fuissent, quum omnes peccato originali sint infecti. Neque enim actuale peccatum est ejus causa, quia sic nulli infantes, etiam blasphemorum Judaeorum, Turcarum, et aliorum Gentilium, vel in utero materno vel paulo post natiuitatem mortui essent a Deo reprobatii. Ergo, etc.*" This, however, was only an excrescence, and not an essential feature of the system.

§ I. *Views entertained by the Reformers on the doctrine of Justification.*

It has been with unaccountable singularity maintained in our own time that the term *justification* is of recent coinage.* All the reformers, however, employ the term *justificatio*. Hence it must be at least upwards of three hundred years old. Not only this, but the schoolmen use it: e. g. *Thomas Aquinas*, who was born A. D. 1254. Nor is this all: for we find it of very frequent occurrence in an author who stands deservedly high in the estimation of all true Calvinists: We refer to *Augustine*, who was born fifteen hundred years ago. The term is likewise employed by *Ambrose*, *Oecumenius*, etc. etc.

But, as we have already remarked, it is foreign from our intention to mingle in the agitating controversies now pending in the American churches on this subject. Yet we hope to be pardoned, if, in treating this subject historically, we find it necessary to refer to some facts of recent occurrence in relation to these controversies. If in so doing we should give offence, it will be altogether unintentional, as our sole object by such reference is to place before our readers the views on this subject, which have been pronounced erroneous, as well as those which have been approved, and thus to enable them at once to compare such views with those entertained on the like points by the reformers themselves; whose views it is our intention to present as fully as the limits which are allowed us will permit.

The disputes referred to in a note on a preceding page, have excited the deepest interest in a large denomination of American Christians. The whole denomination appears to be nearly equally divided in relation to it. Learning and talent of the first order are found on either side. Those who are charged with maintaining that justification is synonymous with pardon, have been pronounced on that account sufficiently unsound in the faith to warrant their coerced separation from those who assume the opposite ground; and it is affirmed that their speculations and views seriously endanger, if they do not entirely subvert the doctrine of justification by faith alone; the great leading doctrine, and very pillar of the Reformation.†

* "Justification is a modern Latin word, coined to express a particular thought." "Dr. Junkin's Vindication," p. 134.

† See "Trial of the Rev. Albert Barnes before the Synod of Philadelphia in Session at York, Pa. Oct. 1835." pp. 154 — 235.

On the contrary they who have been thus charged and their brethren who agree with them, maintain that they *do not* hold that justification, and pardon, or remission of sin, are one and the same thing. And further; that even if they had avowed this belief, they would not thereby have materially departed from the doctrine of the Reformation, and that therefore they cannot consistently be pronounced heretical on this subject, unless the noble army who achieved the Reformation share a similar fate. As we are about to enter upon an investigation of the subject in controversy, may the Great Head of the church vouchsafe his blessing upon our feeble efforts, that, to some extent they may heal the dissensions of his blood-bought Zion; and tend to the restoration of confidence and peace within her borders.

The position which we expect to establish is that *the reformers employed the terms pardon, or forgiveness, and justification interchangeably, and really as synonymes*. Our quotations will be brief, and such as, we doubt not, will prove satisfactory to all who candidly regard them. By way of introduction to this part of the subject we shall furnish the reader with a specimen or two of the language employed with respect to this doctrine in the time of the great Augustine and later; from which we shall pass on to the first centuries of the Reformation.

Our translations are designed to be strictly accurate and as much condensed as practicable, while, for the satisfaction of the classical reader, we shall throw the originals of our excerpts into notes at the bottom of the page.

I. Let us then hear Augustine, the great defender of the doctrines of grace against Pelagius. He says, "*Our sanctuary is the forgiveness of sins, which is to be justified by his blood. When God the Father is displeased with us, he considers the death of his Son in our behalf, and becomes reconciled. My entire hope is in the death of my Lord. His death is my merit, my refuge, my salvation, my life, and my resurrection.*"*

If it should be objected that this writer appears sometimes to

* *Assylum nostrum remissio peccatorum : quid est justificari sanguine ipsius. Cum nobis irasceretur, Deus Pater videt mortem filii sui pro nobis, et placatus est nobis.—Tota spes mea in morte Domini est. Mors ejus meritum meum est, refugium meum, salus mea, vita et resurrectio mea. De Civitate Dei, Lib. II. cap. 2, and De Trinitate, Lib. XIII.*

confound sanctification with justification, we answer, that we admit it. But let it be remembered that such an objection is no refutation of the argument from the above quotations.

II. *Ambrose* was undoubtedly the most correct, as a theologian, of any of his age. He was Augustine's contemporary. In 1 Cor. 1: 4, he remarks: "For thus is it ordained by God that he who believes in Christ shall be saved without the deeds of the law; freely receiving by faith alone *the forgiveness of sins.*"*

III. *Oecumenius* says: "How may we be justified? By *forgiveness* which is in Christ Jesus."†

IV. *Bernard* (whose testimony is the last that we shall cite) says that "*Christ is made our righteousness by the pardon of sin.*"‡

We might adduce also the testimony of *Justin Martyr*, *Origen*, etc., but prefer to pass on to that of the reformers. And first, we adduce

V. *John Calvin*. This writer employs the phrases "*imputation of righteousness*," and "*justification*" to mean the same thing; and he explains them both to signify simply "*the pardon of sin.*" This will be manifest from the quotations which follow.

In his *Institutes*, he lays down the following as a formal definition of justification. "Justification in its plain and simple acception we understand to be that acceptance of us, by which God regards us, being received into favor, as righteous. And we affirm that it consists in the forgiveness of sins, and in the imputation of the righteousness of Christ."§ After which he goes on to explain himself, and unequivocally declares that justification is only to absolve from guilt or approve *as innocent*; and that "*imputation of righteousness*" is only other phraseolo-

* "Quia hoc constitutum est a Deo, ut qui credit in Christum, salvus sit sine opere. Sola fide gratis recipiens peccatorum remissionem."

† "Quomodo sit justificatio? per remissionem quam in Christo Iesu consequimur." In *Manuali*, cap. 22.

‡ "Christus factus est nobis justitia in absolutione peccatorum."—Ser. XXII. in *Cont.*

§ "Nos justificationem simpliciter interpretamur acceptionem, que nos Deus in gratiam receptos pro justis habet. Eamque in peccatorum remissione ac justitiæ Christi imputatione positam esse dicimus."

gy for "forgiveness of sins." * We adduce his own language.

"To justify therefore is nothing else than to absolve from guilt, (as having been approved innocent), him who had been adjudged guilty. When therefore God justifies us at the intercession of Christ, *he absolves us*, not by approving our own innocence but by the imputation of righteousness; that we may be accounted as righteous in Christ who are not so in ourselves. Thus, in the language of Paul in Acts 13: 38, "By this man forgiveness of sins is declared to you; and whosoever believeth in him is justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses." Here you see that justification is placed *after the remission of sins, as if exegetically*; you see plainly that it means *absolution*; you perceive that it precludes works of law; that it is the mere favor of Christ, and that it is to be received by faith. And further you perceive that a *satisfaction* is interposed where it is said that we are justified from sin through Christ. So also when the publican is said to have descended from the temple we dare not say that his righteousness was obtained by any merit of works. *This, therefore, is said, that after he obtained pardon of sin, he was accounted righteous before God.* Righteousness therefore was not by an approval of works, *but by the free forgiveness of God.* Wherefore Ambrose elegantly denominates the confession of sins, legitimate justification. But omitting dispute about the word, if we enter upon consideration of the thing itself, as it is described to us, no doubt will remain. For Paul clearly designates justification by the name of acceptation, when he says in Eph. 1: 5, 'We are predestinated unto the adoption through Christ, according to the good pleasure of God unto the praise of his glorious grace, by which he hath received us into great favor.' For this is that which he has elsewhere declared (Rom. 3: 24), that God justifies us freely. But in Rom. 4: 6—8, *he calls it the imputation of righteousness, nor doubts that it consists in the forgiveness of sins.* His words are, 'The man is said by David to be blessed whom God accepts, or to whom he imputes righteousness without works, as it is written, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, etc.' (Ps. 32: 1.)

* The apparent discrepancy in the language of Calvin on this subject, will be rendered perfectly intelligible by the subsequent quotations from Calvinistic divines; particularly Pareus, Tilanus, etc.

Here truly he does not speak of a part of justification, but of it in the whole. Furthermore, he openly avows the definition of the word [justification] attached to it by David, when he pronounces them to be blessed to whom has been given a free pardon of sin. Whence it appears that this righteousness of which he speaks, is simply opposed to guilt.* And again, he says: "But Oslander may respond to me in the passage where Paul says that David describes righteousness without works in these words: Blessed are they whose iniquities are

* "Justificare ergo nihil aliud est, quam eum qui reus agebatur, tanquam approbata innocentia a reatu absolvere. Quum itaque nos Christi intercessionem justificet Deus, non propriæ innocentie approbatione, sed justitiæ imputatione nos absolvit: ut pro justis in Christo censeamur, qui in nobis non sumus. Sic Actorum, cap. 13. (v. 38.) in concione Pauli: 'Per hunc vobis annuntiatur remissio peccatorum, et ab omnibus iis a quibus non potuistis justificari in lege Moysi, omnis qui credit in eum, justificatur.' Vides post remissionem peccatorum justificationem hanc velut interpretationis loco poni: vides aperte pro absolutione sumi: vides operibus legis adimi: vides merum Christi beneficium esse: vides fide percepit: vides denique interponi satisfactionem, ubi dicit nos a peccatis justificari per Christum. Sic quum publicanus dicitur (Luc. 18: 14) justificatus e templo decendisse, non possumus dicere aliquo operum merito consequutum esse justitiam. Hoc ergo dicitur, post impetratam peccatorum veniam pro justo esse coram Deo habitum. Justus ergo fuit non operum approbatione, sed gratuita Dei absolutione. Quare eleganter Ambrosius, qui peccatorum confessionem vocat justificationem legitimam (in Ps. cxviii. Serm. 10). 4. Atque ut omittamus contentionem de voce, rem ipsam si intuemur qualiter nobis describitur, nulla manebit dubitatio. Nam Paulus *acceptiois* nomine certe justificationem designat quum dicit ad Ephesios cap. 1. v. 5: 'Destinati sumus in adoptionem per Christum, secundum bene placitum Dei in laudem gloriosæ, ipsius gratiæ, qua nos acceptos vel gratiosos habuit.' Id enim ipsum vult quod alibi dicere solet (Rom. 3: 24), Deum nos gratuito justificare. Quarto autem capite ad Romanos (v. 6—8), primum appellat justitiæ *imputationem*: nec eam dubitat in peccatorum remissione collocare. 'Beatus homo (inquit) a Davide dicitur, cui Deus accepto fert vel imputat justitiam sine operibus: sicut scriptum est, Beati quorum remissæ sunt iniquitates,' etc. (Ps. 32: 1.) Illic sane non de justificationis parte, sed de ipsa tota disputat. Ejus porro definitionem a Davide positam testatur, quum beatos esse pronuntiat, quibus datur gratuita peccatorum venia. Unde apparet, justitiam hanc, de qua loquitur, simpliciter reatu opponi." *Institutio*, Lib. III. cap. 11. 3, 4. *The-olock's Edition*, Vol. II. p. 7, 8.

forgiven (Rom. 4: 7. Ps. 32: 1). Is this a complete definition of justification, or a partial one? Most assuredly he does not adduce the prophetic testimony as if it taught that the pardon of sins was a *part* of righteousness! or that it merely unites with something else in justifying man! But David *embraces our entire righteousness in gratuitous forgiveness*; declaring that man to be blessed whose sins are covered, to whom God remits iniquities, and to whom he does not impute transgressions. He estimates and reckons his happiness from thence, that he is righteous in this manner, not in very deed, but by imputation.”*

Further on in the same chapter he remarks, “Now let us examine the truth of that which is affirmed in the definition, viz., that the righteousness of faith is reconciliation with God, *which consists alone in the forgiveness of sins*. It is an axiom never to be forgotten that the whole world of mankind are under the wrath of God so long as they continue sinners. Isaiah beautifully declares this truth in the following words, (chap. 59: 1, etc.): ‘The Lord’s hand is not shortened that it cannot save: neither is his ear heavy that he cannot hear: But your iniquities have made a separation between you and your God; and your sins have hid his face from you that he may not hear.’ In this we perceive that sin is a separation between man and God, a turning of the countenance of God from the sinner. Nor can it be otherwise, when it is truly foreign from his righteousness to have any intercourse with sin. Whence the apostle teaches that man is an enemy to God, until restored into favor by Christ (Rom. 5: 8—10). Whom therefore the Lord receives into fellowship he is said to justify; because he can neither receive into favor nor unite man to himself, *until from a sinner he makes him righteous*. We add that *this is done by the remission of sins*. For if by their works they be estimated whom the Lord reconciles to himself, they will still be found to

* “Jam vero mihi respondeat Osiander, ubi dicit Paulus describi a Davide justitiam sine operibus in his verbis, Beati quorum remissae sunt iniquitates (Rom. 4: 7. Ps. 32: 1): Sitne plena haec definitio, an dimidia. Certe Prophetam non adducit testem, acsi doceret partem justitiam esse veniam peccatorum, vel ad hominem justificandum concurrere: sed totam justitiam in gratuita remissione includit, beatum hominem pronuntians, cujus tecta sunt peccata, cui remisit Deus iniquitates, et cui transgressionem non imputat: felicitatem ejus inde aestimat et censet, quia hoc modo justus est non re ipsa, sed imputatione.” Vide ut supra, cap. 11. 11.

be truly sinners, whom, notwithstanding we must regard as pure and released from sin. *It appears therefore, that those whom God receives into favor, are not otherwise made righteous, save that their corruptions having been washed away they are purified by the forgiveness of sins; as such righteousness can be in one word denominated the forgiveness of sins.*"* These passages place the opinions of Calvin on this subject beyond controversy.

VI. *Ursinus* is our next witness. He was the writer of the Heidelberg Catechism; and a man who was not only of the strictest sect of Calvinists, but in every respect abundantly qualified to teach theology in Calvin's presence and from Calvin's chair. He was contemporary with Calvin, and died in 1583. His testimony is very explicit. In his exposition of the Heidelberg Catechism (a book from which more sound theology can be learned than from almost any other of its size except the Bible), he remarks Question 60 (p. 339), as follows: "Righteousness is conformity with law, or the fulfilment of law, or it is that by which we are righteous before God. *Justification* is the application of righteousness to any one. Hence righteousness and justification differ from each other as the form differs

* "Nunc illud quam verum sit excutiamus, quod in definitione dictum est, justitiam fidei esse reconciliationem cum Deo, quae sola peccatorum remissione constat. Semper ad illud axioma redeundum est, universis iram Dei incumbere, quamdiu peccatores esse perseverant. Id eleganter significavit Jesaias his verbis (59: 1 seq.): 'Non est abbreviata manus Domini, ut servare nequeant: neque aggravata auris ejus, ut non exaudiat: sed iniquitates vestrae dissidium fecerunt inter vos et Deum vestrum, et peccata vestra absconderunt faciem ejus a vobis, ne exaudiat.' Audimus peccatum esse divisionem inter hominem et Deum, vultus Dei aversionem a peccatore: nec fieri aliter potest, quandoquidem alienum est ab ejus justitia, quicquam commercii habere cum peccato. Unde Apostolus inimicum esse Deo hominem docet, donec in gratiam per Christum restituitur (Rom. 5: 8-10). Quem ergo Dominus in conjunctionem recepit, eum dicitur justificare: quia nec recipere in gratiam, nec sibi adjungere potest, quin ex peccatore justum faciat. Istud iddumus fieri per peccatorum remissionem. Nam si ab operibus aestimentur quos sibi Dominus reconciliavit, reperientur etiamnum revera peccatores, quos tamen peccato solutos purosque esse oportet. Constat itaque, quos Deus amplectitur, non aliter fieri justos nisi quod abstersis peccatorum remissione maculis purificantur: ut talis justitia uno verbo appellari queat peccatorum remissio." Ut supra, cap. 11. 21.

from the application of the form to the subject ; as, for instance, whiteness differs from making white. But in justification there is a distinction likewise to be observed. There is a legal justification and an evangelical. *Legal justification* is the producing conformity with God, and with the law in ourselves. This is begun in us when we are born again by the Holy Spirit. *Evangelical justification* is the application of evangelical righteousness ; or it is the imputation of another's righteousness which is without us, in Christ ; or it is the imputation and application of *the righteousness of Christ which he procured for us by dying upon the cross and rising again from the dead*. It is not the transfusion into us of righteousness or of any qualities ; but *an absolution from sins in the judgment of God on account of the righteousness of another*. Hence justification and the forgiveness of sins are the same thing.*

Again, on Question 61 (p. 345), he says, " We are justified by faith alone, that is, for the sake of the merit of Christ alone we receive by faith forgiveness of sins."† Again, on p. 342, he says, "*justifying*, in the church, does not signify *legally* to make a person righteous, and endued with the quality of righteousness, out of one who is unrighteous ; but *evangelically*, to *absolve an unrighteous person from guilt, as if he were righteous, and not to punish him* ; for the sake of the satisfaction of another imputed to him. Thus the Scripture uses this word ; and in almost all languages the signification is the same. For the word קִיָּיִץ to *justify*, signifies with the Hebrews, to *absolve from guilt, to pronounce innocent* : See Ex. 23: 7. Prov.

* "*Justitia est conformitas cum lege, seu legis impletio, seu res, qua justi sumus coram Deo. Justificatio est justitiae applicatio ad aliquem. Differunt igitur justitia et justificatio, ut forma et applicatio formae ad subjectum, ut albedo et dealbatio seu albificatio. Dividitur autem justificatio, sicut justitia. Alia est legalis, alia evangelica. Legalis justificatio est effectio conformitatis cum Deo et lege in nobis. Haec inchoatur in nobis, cum per spiritum Sanctum regeneramur. Evangelica justificatio est applicatio justitiae evangelicae : seu est imputatio justitiae alienae, quae est extra nos in Christo : seu est imputatio et applicatio justitiae Christi, quam pro nobis moriendo in cruce et resurgendo praestitit. Non est transfusio justitiae aut qualitatium in nos, sed absolutio a peccatis in judicio Dei propter alienam justitiam. Idem igitur sunt justificatio et remissio peccatorum.*"

† "Sola igitur fide justificamur, hoc est, propter solius Christi meritum fide accipimus remissionem peccatorum."

17: 15. *Δικαιοῦν* sometimes signifies even with the Greeks *δικαίον νομίζειν*, to judge or pronounce righteous; sometimes *κολάζειν* to affect with punishment, the cause being known in judgment, Suidas observes: So Christ says, ‘By your words you shall be justified.’ Matt. 12: 37. The former signification is used in a two-fold sense in Scripture; for either it signifies not to condemn but to absolve in judgment, as in Rom. 8: 33, and Luke 18: 14, or it signifies to acknowledge just, to declare just, etc., as in Luke 7: 37. Ps. 51: 6. Rom. 3: 4. *And yet both significations amount to the same thing.* But *justificare*, though the word often occurs among the Latins, is never employed in the sense of making righteous, or of implanting a principle of righteousness: In the Scriptures and in the church, however, the following unequivocal passages declare that it is otherwise used; for they cannot be understood, except of the absolution of the sinner and his gratuitous acceptance. Rom. 8: 38, ‘Who shall accuse the elect of God? It is God who justifieth;’ and Luke 18: 14, ‘The publican went down *justified*,’ that is, absolved from guilt and accepted by God rather than the pharisee. Acts 13: 38, 39, ‘Whosoever believeth is justified from all things from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses:’ and ‘I announce to you the forgiveness of sins,’ etc. In these passages, *to be justified, manifestly signifies to be absolved, and to receive the forgiveness of sins.* Rom. 3: 24, 25, 28, ‘They are justified by grace—justifying him who believes—man is justified without works.’ See also Rom. 4: 5. and 5: 9.”*

* “Justificandi verbum in Ecclesia non significare *legaliter*, ex injusto justum facere, justitiae qualitate indita, sed *evangelice*, injustum in se quasi justum absolvere a reatu nec velle punire, propter alienam satisfactionem ipsi imputatam. Sic utitur hoc verbo scriptura, nec alia est significatio fere in omnibus linguis. Nam קִדְּשָׁהוּ justificare Hebraeis significat reum absolvere, innocentem pronunciare: *Ego non justificabo impium* (Ex. 23: 7). Qui justificat impium, et condemnat insontem, uterque abominatio Jehovae (Prov. 17: 1). *Δικαιοῦν* etiam Graecis significat alias *δικαίον νομίζειν*, justum censere seu pronunciare: alias *κολάζειν* supplicio afficere, causa in judicio cognita, ut Suidas annotat. Sic Christus: *Ex verbis tuis justificaberis*. Prior significatio dupliciter usurpatur in Scriptura. Vel enim significat non condemnare, sed absolvere in judicio (Rom. 8: 33). *Quis condemnabit electos Dei?* Deus est qui justificat (Luc. 18: 14). *Descendit justificatus prae illo*: Vel significat justum agnoscere, declarare, etc. *justificata est sapientia a filius suis* (Luc. 7: 37). *Ut justificeris in ser-*

Once more ; on page 314, 315, he thus speaks : “ *To pardon sin is therefore not to hold sins for no sins, nor is it to be angry and offended with sins, but it is to esteem sinners as no sinners, to absolve them from the guilt and blame of sins, and to repute them just on account of another’s righteousness apprehended and applied by faith.* In short, God remits sins to the believing, because he wills not to punish in them those sins that he punished in Christ the mediator. *To have the forgiveness of sins therefore and to be righteous before God are the same thing.* But it is objected that *the law requires not only that we should not sin, but that we should likewise perform obedience ; it requires not only that we should not do evil, but that we should do good.* And that hence it is not sufficient that sins should be pardoned, but the perfect obedience of the law is also necessary in order that we should be righteous. But to this I answer that even the omission of good is itself sin. ‘He who can do good, and does it not, to him it is sin.’ James 4: 17. But this sin also is remitted to us, because Christ has made abundant satisfaction for all sins, both of omission and commission. ‘The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin.’ 1 John 1: 7. We have therefore in Christ a perfect forgiveness of all sins of omission as well as of commission ; and therefore of the sins of omitted obedience ; and thus we have a perfect righteousness, so that we are accounted righteous before God, by the merit of Christ alone.”* These passages will

monibus tuis (Ps. 51: 6. Rom. 3: 4). Utraque tamen significatio in idem recidit. Justificare autem, pro justum facere, seu justitiæ habitum infundere, apud Latinos nusquam reperitur : et ut maxime reperiri posset : in Scriptura tamen et ecclesia aliter accipi testantur hæc manifesta, loca, quæ non aliter, quam de absolutione et acceptatione gratuita peccatoris possunt intelligi. *Quis accusabit electos Dei ? Deus est qui justificat. Publicanus descendit justificatus*, hoc est, absolutus a reatu, et acceptus Deo magis, quam pharisæus : *Ab omnibus, a quibus per legem Moysi justificari non potuistis, per hunc, quisquis credit, justificatur* (Acts 13: 38, 39). Et : *annuntio vobis remissionem peccatorum*, etc. Hic justificari manifeste significat absolvi, et accipere remissionem peccatorum : *Justificantur gratis. Justificans eum, qui est ex fide. Hominem justificare absque operibus. Ei qui non operatur, sed credit in eum qui justificat impium, imputatur fides sua ad justitiam. Justificati ejus sanguine. Reconciliati Deo per mortem.*” Rom. 3: 24, 26, 28, et cap. 4: 5, et cap. 5: 9.

* “Remittere igitur peccata non est, peccata pro non peccatis habere, vel peccatis non offendi et irasci, sed peccatores habere pro non

suffice to make known the views of Dr. Ursinus. We have others marked for quotation, but shall omit them.

VII. We shall next hear the testimony of *Paraeus*. He wrote the work from which I quote, *Anno* 1598, and is a theologian of splendid intellect and attainments, and one who with Calvinists has always occupied the very first rank of standard excellence. In reading the later writers you often meet with his name in the following associations, "*Calvin, Beza, Paraeus.*" *Paraeus* and *Hutterus*, of whom, the first is the Alpha of the Calvinists, the second the Beta of the Lutherans. His very name was a terror to the Romish church, as may be seen by reading almost any of her champions who were his contemporaries ;* and his powerful *Anatome Arminianismi* spread an alarm through the Arminian camp, scarcely equalled until *Edwards on the Will* appeared. In relation to the subject under discussion this eminent theologian uses the following unequivocal language. "The plain and simple sentiment of the Scriptures is, that we are justified *for the sake of the blood and*

peccatoribus, seu peccatores absolvere a peccatorum reatu et culpa, et reputare pro justis, propter satisfactionem alienam, fide apprehensam et applicatam. *Breviter* : Deus remittit credentibus peccata, quia non vult ea in ipsis punire, eo quod punit in Christo mediatore. Idem ergo sunt, habere remissionem peccatorum, et, esse justum coram Deo. *Contra* : Lex non tantum requirit, ut non peccamus : sed etiam ut praestemus obedientiam : non tantum ut omittamus mala, sed etiam ut faciamus bona. Ergo non satis est, ut peccata sint condonata, sed etiam necessaria est perfecta legis praestatio, ad hoc, ut simus justi. *Respond* : Etiam omissio boni est peccatum. Qui enim potest facere bonum, et non fecit, ei peccatum est. Jacob. 4: 17. Sed etiam hoc peccatum nobis remittitur : quia Christus pro omnibus peccatis tam omissionis, quam commissionis sufficientissime satisfecit. Sanguis Jesu Christi purgat nos ab omni peccato, 1 Johan. 1: 7. Habemus igitur in Christo perfectam remissionem omnium peccatorum, tam omissionis, quam commissionis : proinde etiam peccati omissionis obedientiae, et sic perfectam justitiam : ut unice Christi merito coram Deo justus reputamur." *Vide ad Quaest. LVI. 1.*

* See, for example, *De Pace Germaniae*, by *Adam Coutzen*. The character of *Paraeus* is admirably drawn in the following inscription under his portrait :

"*Augustinus eras calamo, Chrysostomus ore,
Verbi aperire potens mystica sensa Dei.
Fulmen eras Latiae turbae, quae Numen adorat
Romanum, et lapides, lignaque muta colit.*"

death of Christ, and that our justification is the forgiveness of sins." * "The Scripture defines our whole justification by the forgiveness of sins for the sake of the blood of Christ. Therefore the effusion of his blood alone is that of which we are justified by imputation. And the forgiveness of sins is our complete justification—to be absolved, to be justified, to be forgiven, are the same." † "I affirm unhesitatingly that the uniform language of the entire Gospel is that we are justified by the death and blood of the Son of God, and that our justification consists in the forgiveness of sins alone.—But thou repliest that the punishment of sin is not sufficient to constitute righteousness, but also the fulfilment of the law is required. To this I answer, that the punishment is itself the fulfilment of the law; hence therefore it is sufficient. For the law is fulfilled in a twofold manner; either by the performance of perfect obedience; or, if it has been violated, by the suffering of a sufficient punishment. Each mode satisfies the justice of God; and in each mode therefore the law is fulfilled and righteousness obtained." ‡ We would gladly extend this quotation, but our limits forbid.

Again; in considering objections he thus remarks: (the reader will please to pay especial attention to this quotation, as it will explain the apparent contradiction in the language of Calvin, as remarked on a former page), "But you will say that some celebrated theologians teach that justification consists in

* "*Scripturae phrasis plana sententia simplex est; nos justificari propter sanguinem et mortem Christi, et justificationem nostram esse remissionem peccatorum.*"

† "*Scriptura totam justificationem nostram definit remissione peccatorum propter sanguinem Christi: Ergo sola sanguinis effusio est id cujus imputatione justificamur: et remissio peccatorum est tota nostra justificatio.—Hic absolvi, justificari, habere remissionem peccatorum, idem valent.*"

‡ "*Veriorem dico, quia constans vox est totius Evangelii, nos justificari morte et sanguine filii Dei, et justificationem nostram in sola remissione peccatorum consistere. Testimonia Evangelii supra sunt recitata.—At, inquis, ad justitiam non satis est poena pro peccato, sed et requiritur impletio legis. Resp. Etiam poena est impletio legis, Ergo sufficit. Dupliciter enim lex impletur vel per obedientiae perfectae praestationem, vel cum haec est violata, per sufficientis poenae perpeccionem: Utraque satisfat justitiae Dei. Utraque igitur est legis impletio, est justitia et δικαιοσύνη.*"

the forgiveness of sins, and the imputation of righteousness ; and that therefore it does not consist in forgiveness alone. *I answer*, that neither do I deny that it consists in these. But how ? as integral parts, neither of which is the whole of justification ? By no means ; but as acts differing in reason only, not in subject ; in respect of the different ‘ terminos *a quo*, and *ad quam*,’ etc. As, for example, the whitening of a wall is by the expulsion of blackness and the coating over with whiteness ; yet it is one and the same act by which the wall is whitened and blackness removed, and so on the contrary. Therefore they are one action differing only in reason. The filling up of a vessel is by the removal of vacancy, and the infusion of liquor, yet they are done by one and the same act ; as when a person is clothing himself, it is but one and the same act by which the body is clad, and nakedness overcome. Still, both are accomplished by the same single act. Thus therefore in justification (which is not unlike being clothed), the forgiveness of sins and the imputation of righteousness unite ; not as separate actions or parts, but as acts differing in term only. For God by forgiving our sins for the sake of the righteousness of Christ, imputes that unto us, and by imputing that to us he remits our sins. *Hence therefore these are customarily joined together in justification, not so much copulatively as exegetically*, the latter implying the former.”* We need yet to add only the following passage

* “ At, inquires, theologi praedicti docent justificationem constare remissione peccatorum et imputatione justitiae. Ergo non constat remissione sola. *Resp.* Nec ego nego his constare. Sed quomodo ? an ut partibus integralibus, quarum neutra sit tota justificatio ? Nequaquam : sed ut actibus, ratione tantum, non subjecto differentibus, respectu differentium terminorum a quo et ad quem : qualibus constare solent actiones, quae fiunt contrariorum immediatorum ἀπορριψαι καὶ θεσειν quaeque cum re ipsa et subjecto sint una actio, tamen distinguuntur τῷ λόγῳ et respectu. Verbi causa dealbatio parietis sit pulsione nigredinis, et aspersione albedinis : simul tamen et eadem actione, qua haec aspergitur, illa pellitur, et contra. Ideo sunt una actio ratione tantum differens. Repletio vasis sit pulsione vacui, et infusione liquoris : utraque tamen sit una actione vestitura, ut sic loquar, qua vestitur corpus, sit regendo meditatem et applicando vestem. Eadem tamen actione sit utrumque. Sic igitur in justificatione, (quae vestiturae non est absimilis,) concurrunt remissio peccatorum et imputatio justitiae non ut diversae actiones vel partes, sed ut actus terminis differentes. Nam Deus remittendo nobis peccata propter justitiam

from this great divine : “ The distinctions between being not unrighteous and being righteous, between not transgressing the law and fulfilling it, between being not dead, and being alive, have more in them of what is subtle, than of what is true ! *for they are terms which truly signify the same thing.* For he who is not unrighteous before God, is necessarily righteous ; he who does not transgress the law, fulfils it ; and he who is not dead, is alive, etc. If by the imputation of the passive obedience of Christ we are not as yet righteous, but only not unrighteous, how can it be true that we are justified by the blood of Jesus ? reconciled by his death, etc ? If the forgiveness of sins is not complete justification, how can it be true that *blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven ?* Rom. iv. And how did the apostle take the phrases *to impute righteousness*, and *not to impute sin*, to mean the same thing ?—If it is not by the passive, but by the active obedience of Christ that we are justified, how is Christ not dead in vain ? for why was it necessary for Christ to die, and by dying to merit forgiveness of sins for us, if righteousness had been merited for us by his living holily and righteously ? For righteousness necessarily presupposes forgiveness of sins.” *

VIII. *Melancthon*, in his *Common Places*, remarks : “ *Jus-*

*Christi, eandem imputat, et eam imputando peccata remittit. Con-
jungi ergo haec solet in justificatione non tam copulative quam exe-
getice, ut posterius declarat prius.*”

* Distinctiones inter non injustum et justum esse, inter legem non transgredi, et legem implere, inter non mortuum et vivum esse : plus habent subtilitatis, quam veritatis, cum revera sint termini aequi-
pollentes, ut postea ostendam. Necessario enim qui coram Deo non
est injustus est justus : qui legem non transgreditur implet : qui non
est mortuus, vivit : siquidem haec omnia sunt contraria *αμεσα* : quo-
rum uno posito, vel negato, necesse sit poni vel negari alterum. Si
passivae obedientiae imputatione nondum sumus just, sed tantum non
injusti quomodo verum illud : justificati per sanguinem filii ejus : re-
conciliati per mortem, etc. Si remissio peccatorum non est justifica-
tio tota : quomodo verum illud : *Beati quorum remissae sunt iniqui-
tates* : Rom. iv. et quomodo Apostolus ibidem pro eodem sumit, *impu-
tare justitiam*, et, *non imputare peccatum* ?—Si non passiva sed activa
obedientia Christi justificamur : quomodo Christus non est frustra
mortuus ? Quid enim necesse erat Christum mori et moriendo mereri
nobis remissionem peccatorum : si juste et sancte vivendo jam meri-
tus nobis erat justitiam ? Justitia enim remissionem peccatorum ne-
cessario praesupponit.”

tification signifies forgiveness of sins, or, the acceptance of a person to life eternal.”*

IX. We shall now refer to several Confessions of Faith. Our first is the *French Confession*.

“*We believe that our whole justification is founded in the forgiveness of our sins, in which also our felicity entirely consists, as David says. Therefore we reject all other means of being just before God; and presuming not upon other merits and virtues, we rest simply upon the obedience of Jesus Christ, which is imputed to us, that all our sins may be covered, and we obtain favor before God. — We believe that we become partakers of this righteousness by faith alone, as it is written: He suffered to purchase salvation for us,*” etc.† Articles 18, 20.

X. We cannot pay much attention to the order of time, and shall next refer to the *Augustan* (or *Augsburg*) *Confession*. It was written A. D. 1530. “The churches likewise teach, that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits or works, but that they are justified by grace through faith, for the sake of Christ, when they believe that they are received into favor, and that their sins have been forgiven on account of Christ, *who by his death made satisfaction for our sins. This faith God imputes to us as righteousness. Rom. 3: 4.*”‡

* “*Justificatio significat remissionem peccatorum, seu acceptationem personae ad vitam aeternam.*” *Locis Communibus*. See also his Preface to Vol. III. of the Works of Luther.

† Not being in possession of a Latin copy of this Confession, we have been obliged to consult the French version. “XVIII. Nous croyons, que toute notre justice est fondée en la remission de nos pechez, comme aussi c’est notre seule félicité, comme dit David. C’est pourquoi nous rejettons tous les autres moyens de nous pouvoir justifier devant Dieu: et sans presumer de nulles vertus ni merites, nous nous tenons simplement à l’obeissance de Jesus-Christ laquelle nous est allouée, tout pour couvrir toutes nos fautes, que pour nous faire trouver grace et faveur devant Dieu. — XX. Nous croyons que nous sommes faits participans de cette justice, par la seule foi; comme il est dit, qu’il a souffert pour nous acquirir le salut.”

‡ “Item docent, quod homines non possint justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recepi, et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro justitia coram ipso. Rom. 3: 4. Art. IV.”

XI. The *Saxony Catechism*, framed Anno 1571. "*The forgiveness of sin differs not from justification. Hence justification is defined to be remission of sins, reconciliation with God, imputation of righteousness, and acceptance to life eternal.*"*

XII. Not having the original of the following Confession (the *Belgic*) by me, I am obliged to make the subsequent extract from a miserable abridgement, and even a perversion of the '*Harmony of Confessions*,' recently published in America. It reads thus: "We believe that *all our happiness consists in the forgiveness of sins*, which we have by Jesus Christ, and that in it alone all our righteousness is contained, as St. Paul teacheth, out of the prophet David, who declareth the happiness of those men to whom God imputeth righteousness without works. And the same apostle saith, Rom. iii. and iv. that 'We are justified by the redemption made in Christ Jesus.' We therefore, leaning upon this as a sure foundation, do yield all glory to God, having a most base and humble opinion of ourselves, knowing full well who and what manner of creatures we be indeed. Therefore we do not presume of ourselves, or of any of our own merits, but *being upholden by the holy obedience of Christ crucified, we do rest altogether in it: and to the intent it may become ours, we believe on him. This righteousness alone is all-sufficient, both to cover all our iniquities*, and also to make us safe and secure against all temptations," etc. Art. XXIII.

XIII. *Wendeline*, whose character as a profound and consistent Calvinist, is of the highest standing, shall be our next witness. On pp. 565—590 of his *Christian Theology*, we meet with the following language: "*Evangelical Justification* is that by which a sinner is absolved from the curse of the law, and by grace accounted righteous before God, for the sake of the righteousness or merit of Christ, apprehended and applied by true faith. *Legal justification* is that by which any one is pronounced righteous in himself, from his own inherent righteousness and innocency. Before the divine tribunal no one is justified, that is, absolved from the curse of the law, and pronounced innocent and righteous, except by evangelical righteousness and justification. For as many as are of the works

* "Remissio peccatorum et justificatio non differunt. Ideo justificatio definitur, quod sit remissio peccatorum, reconciliatio cum Deo, imputatio justitiæ, et acceptatio ad vitam æternam." *Catechesis Saxonia.*

of the law are under the curse. Gal. 3: 10. And it is manifest that no man can be righteous with God but by the law. v. 11." *

Again: "Theologians remark that forgiveness of sins or absolution from the curse, and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, are not two integral parts of justification, or two acts really and numerically distinct: *but only one act* respecting the two '*terminos a quo* and *ad quem*.' Even as by one and the same act darkness is expelled from the atmosphere and light introduced into it; so by one and the same act of justification, the sinner is absolved from guilt and pronounced righteous. *Whence we are sure that they express the whole nature of justification who affirm that it consists in the forgiveness of sins*, and also those who affirm that it consists in the imputation of righteousness. Because, when God forgives our sins, he pronounces us righteous through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ: and when he pronounces us righteous through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, he forgives our sins." † Again: "But that we are *justified* before God, *that is, absolved from the curse of the law*, not by our inherent righteousness, but by the righteousness of Christ im-

* "*Evangelica justificatio est, qua peccator absolvitur a maledictione legis, et justus refutatur coram Deo gratis, propter Christi justitiam seu meritum vera fide apprehensum ac applicatum. Legalis justificatio est, qua quis justus pronunciatur in se propria suo et inherente justitia ac innocentia. Coram tribunali divino nemo justificatur, hoc est, a maledictione legis absolvitur, innocensque et justus pronunciatur nisi justitia et justificatione Evangelica. Quotquot enim ex operibus legis, sub execratione sunt. Gal. 3: 10. Et manifestum est nullum per legem justificari apud Deum. ver. 11."*

† "Notant theologi, remissionem peccatorum sed absolutionem a maledictione, et imputationem justitiae Christi non esse duas justificationis partes integrantes, vel actus numero et realiter distinctos; sed unum esse duntaxat actum duos respicientem terminos, *a quo* et *ad quem*: veluti uno eodemque actu tenebrae ex aëre pelluntur, et lumen in aërem introducitur, sic uno eodemque justificationis actu peccator a reatu absolvitur et justos pronunciatur. Unde colligimus eos totam justificationis naturam exprimere, qui aiunt eam in remissione peccatorum consistere, et qui dicunt eam in imputatione justitiae consistere: quia dum remittit nobis Deus peccata, nos justos pronunciat per imputationem justitiae Christi: et dum justos nos pronunciat per imputationem justitiae Christi, peccata nobis remittit." *Christ. Theolog. Lib. I. Cap. XXV. p. 587.*

puted to us, we prove in this manner: (1) The material of our justification before God is nothing other than the righteousness of Christ, or his obedience to the law accomplished for us. Therefore we are not *justified, that is, absolved from the curse of the law*, unless by and on account of the righteousness of Christ imputed to us." * — "The justification of the wicked is by imputed righteousness. But the justification of the Christian is the justification of the wicked. Therefore the justification of the Christian is by imputed righteousness. The *proposition* is thus proved: *Because the justification of the wicked is his absolution from punishment.*" †

XIV. Our next witness shall be *Dr. Tilenus* of Sedan. In his *Syntagma*, (the date of the preface to which is A. D. 1606) p. 714, he thus speaks: "To justify, in the Scripture, most frequently signifies, to absolve, to pronounce righteous and innocent, 2 Kings 15: 4. Deut. 25: 1. Is. 43: 9, which also the antithesis shows in certain places, where '*to justify*,' and '*to condemn*,' are opposed, Prov. 17: 15. Is. 5: 23, and 50: 8. Rom. 8: 33." ‡

On pp. 724, 725, he speaks as follows: "The forgiveness of sins, and the imputation of righteousness are not diverse parts differing in reality, but only in word: for *either of the two taken separately expresses the whole nature of justification*, as appears from Rom. 4: 6, 7, where the apostle, avowedly treating upon this matter, uses the phrases *to forgive sins* and *to impute righteousness* as equivalent, although this is stoutly denied by Bellarmine. The distinction between these two forms of

* "Justificari autem nos coram Deo, hoc est, a maledictione legis absolvi, non per inhaerentem nobis justitiam sed per imputatam nobis Christi justitiam, probamus: (1) Materia nostrae justificationis coram Deo alia nulla est, nisi Christi justitia, seu obedientia legi pro nobis praestita. Ergo non justificamur, hoc est a maledictione non absolvimur, nisi per et propter Christi justitiam nobis imputatam." *Ibid.*

† "Justificatio impii est per imputatam justitiam. Atqui justificatio Christiani est justificatio impii. Ergo justificatio Christiani sit per imputatam justitiam. *Propositio* prob. Quia justificatio impii est absolutio ejus a poena." *Ibid.*

‡ Justificare in Scriptura frequentissime significat, absolvere; justum et insontem pronunciare. 2 Reg. 15: 4. Deut. 25: 1. Is. 43: 9. Quod et ostendit antithesis in quibusdam locis, ubi *to justify* et *to condemn* opponuntur. Prov. 17: 15. Is. 5: 23 et 50: 8. Rom. 8: 33." *Syntag. Par. II. loc. XLI. Thes. 2.*

speaking, (*not two integral parts of justification*) respects the two 'terminos a quo, and ad quem.' For, as by one and the same act, darkness is expelled and light introduced, so a sinner, by one and the same act of justification, is absolved from guilt and pronounced righteous. *Bellarmino trifles when he pretends that, with our theologians, there are conflicting sentiments, inasmuch as one places justification in the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, while another places it in forgiveness of sins. This is as if he should contend that a man is clothed in one way when his nakedness is covered, and in another way when his garments are put upon him. As ridiculously as does this adversary imagine that darkness can be banished, and cold driven away, so that neither light nor heat need follow in the subject body, so sophistically does he allege that forgiveness of sins effects only this, that we thereby escape the punishment of hell, but do not at the same time obtain the rewards of eternal life. Just as though sin and righteousness were really not so contrary to each other, as that the one being absent the other must be necessarily present: or as if hell was to be considered only as the suffering of the greatest evil, and not the loss of the greatest good. Wherefore, if the forgiveness of sins takes away each part of this punishment, truly it leaves nothing more to be desired. But neither in the thought, nor even by dreaming, can there be imagined a being who is both righteous and unrighteous,—no angel or man, who, although he be not unrighteous, cannot on that account properly be called righteous. Just as if any one should dream of an animal that is not indeed dead, and yet not living! For death and life, perdition and salvation, are not more directly opposed to each other in the mysteries of grace than in nature itself. And hence the authors and abettors of this opinion have invented a new *Tragelaphus*, not unlike the chimera of transubstantiation: imagining accidents to exist, the subject of which cannot be conceived of, much less ascertained."* *

* "Remissio peccatorum, et imputatio justitiae, non sunt partes diversae, aut distinctae τῷ εἶναι, sed duntaxat τῷ λογῶ: nam utraque seorsim sumpta, totam justificationis naturam exprimit, ut patet, Rom. 4: 6, 7, ubi Apostolus hoc argumentum ex professo tractans remittere peccata, et imputare justitiam, tanquam ὑποκαταλαμβάνειν usurpat, quamvis hoc proterve neget Bellarminus. Distinctio inter has duas loquendi formulas, non duas justificationis partes integrantes sed duos respicit terminos a quo, et ad quem. Nam ut uno eodemque actu, et tenebrae ex aëre pelluntur, et lumen in aërem introducit: Sic

XV. We had intended to have quoted some other authorities, *Piscator*, for instance, (see Opp. Tom. I. p. 250,) but think it needless. We shall therefore close these citations with the testimony of the *Synod of Dort*. Not having the original Latin by us, we shall subjoin the *English version*.*

We believe that *our salvation consists, in the remission of our sins for Jesus Christ's sake, and that therein our righteousness before God is implied*, as David and Paul teach us, declaring this to be the happiness of man, that God imputes righteousness to him without works. And the same apostle saith, *that we are justified freely, by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus*. And therefore we always hold fast this foundation, ascribing all the glory to God, humbling ourselves before him, and acknowledging ourselves to be such as we really are, without presuming to trust in any thing

homo impius uno eodemque justificationis actu, et a reatu absolvitur, et justus pronunciatur. Nugas agit Bellarminus, cum pugnantes theologis nostris sententias adfingit, eo quod alius justificationem in imputatione justitiae Christi, alius in remissione peccatorum, sitam esse velit: Perinde ac si contenderet, aliter hominem vestiri, cum tegitur ejus nuditas: aliter, cum applicatur ei vestis. Quam inepte adversarius ille fingit, tenebras quodammodo fugari, frigus depelli posse, ita ut nulla lux, calor nullus in subjecto corpore consequatur: tam sophistice statuit, remissionem peccatorum hoc tantum efficere, ut gehennae poenas evadamus, non item ut coelestis vitae praemia consequamur. Quasi vero peccatum et justitia non sint contraria *ἀντάρια*, quorum uno sublato, necessario ponitur alterum: aut quasi gehenna tantum consideranda sit in perpeffione summi mali, non etiam in amissione summi boni. Quocirca, si remissio peccatorum utramque hanc poenae partem tollit, certe nihil amplius desiderari potest. Nec vero vel cogitatione, imo ne per somnium quidem fingi potest subjectum, justitiae et injustitiae *δῆξιον*, puta, angelus, aut homo, qui non quidem sit injustus: at non propterea recte possit vocari justus: perinde ac si quis animal somniet non quidem mortuum, minime tamen vivens. Neque enim mors et vita, exitium et salus, minus immediate opponuntur in mysteriis gratiae, quam in negotio naturae. Ac proinde hujus commenti autores et assertores novum hic pingunt Tragelaphum, transubstantiationis chimerae non absimilem: accidentia comminiscetes, quorum nullum potest cogitari, nedum reperiri subjectum." *Ibid.* Loc. XLII. Thes. 9, 10, 11, 12 et 13. p. 724, 725.

* See "The Confession of Faith of the Reformed Dutch Church, revised in the national Synod, held at Dordrecht in the years 1618, and 1619." Article XXIII.

in ourselves, or in any merit of ours, *relying and resting upon the obedience of Christ crucified alone*, which becomes ours when we believe in him ; this is sufficient to cover all our iniquities, and to give us confidence, in approaching to God ; freeing the conscience of fear, terror and dread, without following the example of our first father, Adam, who, trembling, attempted to cover himself with fig leaves."

We omit to make quotations from any others, for reasons already intimated. In passing however we remark, that the first reformers, *without a solitary exception*, (I speak only of the eminent ones ; I have read none others), entertained on the subject before us, views similar to those advanced in the fifteen foregoing references. Luther, Zuinglius, Wolfgang Musculus, Oecolampadius, Bullinger, Peter Martyr, Hyperius, etc., etc., received *with one consent*, as the doctrine of God's word, *that we are justified by the death of Christ, when on account of it, (propter eam, is the uniform expression), we have received the forgiveness of sins*. This position, we believe, may be sustained in the fullest and most satisfactory manner.

The question whether pardon and justification are one and the same never was agitated until the latter end of the sixteenth century ; at which time it was started by some obscure individuals in the following form : "*Is the forgiveness of sins the whole, or only a part of our justification ? (Sitne remissio peccatorum tota, an dimidia nostra justificatio ?)*" And for some time after it was started, (with a host of kindred questions), it attracted but little attention.

When however the subject was ultimately brought up fully before the theological world for discussion, the Calvinistic church almost entirely, at the first, took the ground that *pardon was the whole of justification*.. Some however, with Molinaeus, (a divine, who is deservedly held in the very first rank of excellence), took the opposite ground, and the controversy was long and exciting. Piscator, a man who is still admired and quoted by our learned Calvinistic theologians, became the chief antagonist of the views of Molinaeus, and maintained the position, that "*the forgiveness of sins and the imputation of righteousness, are not two parts of justification*." That Piscator was a strict Calvinist, no one will hesitate to acknowledge, who has read his works, or who is aware of the estimation in which he was held by his contemporaries. If we do not greatly mis-

take, the adoption of the opposite principle characterized the followers of Luther long before it did those of Calvin.

By degrees however, the Calvinistic reformers, as well as the Lutheran, were led to make a distinction between forgiveness and justification when they treated upon the subject. They nevertheless still used the terms interchangeably, and asserted that either term might be employed for the other with perfect propriety. That this may be apparent we will present the language of one or two eminent divines who admitted the distinction. Our first is *Dr. Amandus Polanus*, a great favorite with Dr. Gomar, (whose approbation of an author as sound, is a pretty fair proof that he is orthodox) who styles him "*that eminent theologian*," (*egregius theologus*). He wrote A. D. 1609. On pp. 1460, and 1461, of his celebrated *System of Christian Theology*, he thus remarks: "*To justify*, is to absolve from death, not to condemn. But it is not the same thing, properly speaking, as to forgive sins. Because beings may be justified concerning whom there exists no necessity for forgiveness; beings who have no sin, and never committed any, having perfectly fulfilled the law of God. Thus man would have been justified without the pardon of sins, if he had not sinned, but had persisted in rendering obedience to the law. Thus in a forensic judgment the judge absolves the accused who is truly innocent although he does not forgive him any sin. *The justification of the sinner is nothing less than the forgiveness of sins, figuratively, that is metonymically speaking, because the forgiveness of sins is the formal cause of the justification of the sinner, etc.* But properly speaking the justification of the sinner is not forgiveness itself, but absolution from condemnation. Neither are absolution from condemnation, and forgiveness of sins simply the same, because forgiveness embraces far more than such release. A person may be absolved from condemnation who is innocent, and has not sinned, and who needs not the forgiveness of sins. To be declared that any one is absolved from condemnation, and has a right to eternal life, is common alike to legal justification and evangelical. For, as in human judgments debtors are not only justified by an intervening surety, that is, absolved by the judge and not cast into prison; but even those who have been accused innocently are absolved, and truly they ought to be absolved. So likewise before God: sinners are not only absolved on account of Christ, but even the innocent, as holy angels. Man also, if he had ful-

filled the law and had not sinned, would have been *justified*, that is, *absolved from condemnation and freed from eternal death*. Rom. 2: 13." *

And on page 1497, we have the following: "Forgiveness of sins is truly a part of our justification before God. Yet by synecdoche it is often put for the whole of justification: So that it is rightly said that the justification of the sinner before God consists alone in the forgiveness of sins. For the forgiveness of sins does not exclude the imputation of Christ's righteousness, but necessarily presupposes it. Because God forgives sins to no one unless he imputes to him the satisfaction and righteousness of Christ. Truly it excludes our merits and our satisfactions, and whatever modes of justifying before God, have been thought out by men. So also on the contrary it is rightly affirmed that justification before God consists in the alone imputation of the righteousness of Christ; for the imputation of the righteousness of Christ does not exclude the forgiveness of

* *Justificare est absolvere a morte, non condemnare. Id autem non est idem proprie loquendo quod remittere peccata: quia justificari possunt, quibus nulla opus est remissione peccatorum, ut qui nullum habent, nullumque commiserunt peccatum, sed perfecte lege Dei impleverunt. Sic justificatus homo absque remissione peccatorum, si non peccasset, sed in obsequio legis perstitisset: ut dicta de justificatione legali paulo ante citata ostendunt. Ita in judicio forensi judex absolvit accusatum, qui vere innocens est, sic ut peccatum ei non remittat. Justificatio peccatoris nihilominus est remissio peccatorum figurate nimirum metonymice loquendo, quia remissio peccatorum est causa formalis justificationis peccatoris: proprie autem loquendo justificatio peccatoris non est remissio ipsa peccatorum, sed absolutio a condemnatione; Sicut anima rationalis non est proprie loquendo homo, sed causa formalis seu forma hominis. Neque simpliciter idem sunt absolutio a condemnatione et remissio peccatorum quia illa latius patet. Potest enim absolvi a condemnatione qui est innocens et non peccavit, quique remissione peccatorum non eget. Declarari, quod quis absolutus sit a morte aeternae, et jus habeat vitae aeternae, commune est justificationi legali cum justificatione evangelica. Nam ut in judiciis humanis non tantum debitores interveniente sponsore justificantur, id est, absolvuntur a iudice ne in carcerem conjiciantur, sed etiam insontes absolvuntur, et vero absolvi debent: ita etiam coram Deo non tantum peccatores absolvuntur, sed etiam insontes, ut Angeli sancti: item homo si legem implevisset et non peccasset fuisset justificatus, id est, absolutus a condemnatione atque immunis a morte aeterna, Rom. 2: 13, qui legem praestant, justificabuntur. Vide Syntag. Chris. Theolog. Lib. VI. cap. 36.*

sins, but necessarily infers it. For to any one to whom God imputes the righteousness and satisfaction of Christ, to him assuredly he remits sins. Because he forgives those from his mere mercy and free love towards us, for the sake of the intercession and satisfaction of Christ the Mediator applied to us by faith. 1 John 1: 7. Col. 1: 20—22. Rom. 3: 25, etc.” *

One more instance will be quite sufficient, and that one is itself a host. I mean *Dr. Francis Gomar*,—a name synonymous with all that is fervently pious, able, learned, and accomplished. Any one who will read his writings must admit that it is no wonder that *Arminius* shrunk into his appropriate dimensions under his withering glance. In the folio edition of his Works, Vol. I. p. 175, col. 1, he discusses the question “Whether the forgiveness of sins is the entire justification of the faithful before God, for obtaining eternal life,” † in which discussion he affirms not only that the first reformers employed the terms *pardon* and *justification* interchangeably, but also that these terms are thus employed in the word of God: though he explains it by synecdoche.

Gomar refined more on the theology of the Reformation than probably any other of his time. He is perpetually distinguishing, and yet you can almost always see some reason for the refinement. His followers were exceedingly numerous, (in fact the whole body of Calvinists were called after him for many years,) and his refinements with respect to the obedience of

* Est [remissio peccatorum] quidem pars justificationis nostræ coram Deo: Synecdochice tamen frequenter pro tota justificatione ponitur, ita ut recte dicatur justificationem peccatoris coram Deo in sola remissione peccatorum consistere. Nam remissio peccatorum non excludit imputationem justitiæ Christi sed necessario ponit; quia nemini Deus remittit peccata, nisi cui justitiæ et satisfactionem Christi imputavit: Verum excludit tantum merita nostra, satisfactiones nostras et quoscunque modos justificandi coram Deo ab hominibus excogitados. Sicut vicissim recte affirmatur, justificationem coram Deo consistere in sola imputatione justitiæ Christi: nam imputatione justitiæ Christi non excludit remissionem peccatorum, sed necessario infert. Nam cuicumque Deus imputat justitiæ et satisfactionem Christi, eidem certe remittit peccata: quia remittit illa esse mera misericordia et gratuito amore erga nos, propter intercessionem et satisfactionem Christi mediatoris nostri nobis applicatam per fidem. 1 John 1: 7. Col. 1: 20, 21, 22. Rom. 3: 25. Eph. 1: 7. Heb. 9: 22, et cap. 12, 24. Vide ut supra, p. 1497, D. E.

† “Au remissio peccatorum sic tota fidelium, coram Deo, justificatio, ad vitam æternam obtinendam.

Christ, and justification, were subsequently very extensively adopted. The following is a specimen of his language: "Although the forgiveness of sins and the imputation of obedience or of a perfect righteousness are united by an undivided connection, *and from the former the latter can be rightly inferred*, yet, it ought not to be confounded with it." *

The concluding sentence of the treatise above referred to is the following: "And thus far we have labored to illustrate the truth in relation to the forgiveness of sins. And we have proved, that when understood without synecdoche, it is not the whole of our justification before God; but only a part of it, even absolution from the punishment of eternal death due to our sins, for the sake of the satisfaction of Christ. But understood by synecdoche it embraces at the same time the imputation of righteousness to eternal life." † And on p. 541, when answering objections, he says: "The fourth objection is that *the Scriptures put forgiveness of sins and justification for the same, and defines the latter by the former*, Rom. iv. But I answer, that this is done by synecdoche: because the forgiveness of sins is the prior member of justification, which embraces the imputation of Christ's righteousness, by the grace of God united with it *by an indissoluble connection*, although distinct in reality." ‡ Gomar, however, because he departed only thus far from the received doctrine on these topics, was long regarded by many strict Calvinists with distrust, and as an innovator.

Before we leave the present topic for the purpose of taking up the subject of Faith, we hope to be excused for adverting to

* "Ac quamvis individuo nexu remissio peccatorum, et imputatio obedientiae seu perfectae justitiae sint conjuncta: ideoque ex priori alterum recte concludi possit: cum eo tamen confundi non debet." Opp. I. 38. col. 2.

† "Atque hactenus de remissione peccatorum, ad veritatis illustrationem egimus: eamque sine synecdoche acceptam, non esse totam coram Deo justificationem probavimus: sed tantum partem illius; nempe a poena mortis aeternae, peccatis nostris debitae propter Christi satisfactionem absolutionem: per synecdochen vero acceptam, etiam justitiae imputationem ad vitam aeternam simul complecti."

‡ "Quarto objectio est: Scriptura remissionem peccatorum, et justificationem, pro eodem ponit, et hanc per illam definit, Rom. iv. Respondetur, hoc fieri synecdochice: quia remissio peccatorum est prius justificationis membrum, quod ex gratia Dei, individuo nexu, sibi conjunctam habet justitiae Christi imputationem; quamvis re distinctam."

two or three things that have lately grown out of the discussions on Justification in the American churches. We shall refer to them as briefly as is possible.

1. The definition which has recently been given of the term *pardon* is the very definition which the later reformers give of justification, and yet it has been maintained, and still is by professedly strong Calvinists, that pardon and justification are so essentially different as to constitute a breaking point of communion. See e. g. Polanus. He says: "*Proprie loquendo justificatio peccatoris non est remissio ipsa peccatorum, sed absolutio a condemnatione.*" Wendeline, Cloppenburg, etc. use the same language in relation to it. Yet the definition of pardon referred to, is actually a literal rendering into English of their definition of justification: viz. "*Pardon is a release from obligation to suffer punishment.*" *

2. It has also been thought exceedingly erroneous to deny that "the righteousness" of God our Saviour really and properly becomes ours.† But the following is the unvaried language of the reformers in relation to it: "*Nothing therefore is more impious than to assert that the essential righteousness of the Creator is the righteousness of creatures. For from thence it would follow that we possessed the righteousness of God himself, yea, the essence of God, and that we are Gods.*" This passage is from Ursinus. ‡

3. But there are other instances of departure from the views of the Reformation, on the topic before us, which it is proper to notice. Views have been maintained as Calvinistic, which are a much more serious departure from the theology originally pronounced Calvinistic, and the opposites of which agree surprisingly with the venerable men whose testimony we have adduced.

One of these views is, that innocence and righteousness are not the same thing.§ We do not recollect, however, a single

* See Dr. Junkin's *Vindication*, p. 133.

† Mr. Barnes "*denies that the righteousness becomes ours — this is again plain and positive.*" *Vindication*, p. 133.

‡ "*Nihil igitur magis est impium, quam dicere, essentialem justitiam Creatoris esse justitiam creaturarum. Inde enim sequeretur, nos habere ipsius Dei justitiam, imo Dei essentiam, et Deos esse!*" *Explic. Cat. ad Quaest. 64.* p. 354.

§ "My third remark is, that in the very '*Defence*,' he [Mr. Barnes] gives evidence of the truth of the charge [in relation to justification].

writer among the primitive reformers, who did not strenuously maintain the converse of this proposition. The reader, by referring to the preceding quotations, will perceive the justice of this remark, at least to some extent. Abundance of other instances could be easily produced, if necessary, from the divines before Dr. Gomar, who, I believe, wrote his commentaries about A. D. 1625, or later. We cannot conceal our surprise that this doctrine has now been repudiated so unceremoniously, especially since it met with no opposition from the Calvinistic churches even so late as the time of the first President Edwards. In his treatise on *Original Sin*, (Works, Vol. II. p. 411) written against Dr. Taylor of Norwich, that illustrious divine remarks as follows: "In a moral agent, subject to moral obligations, *it is the same thing to be perfectly innocent as to be perfectly righteous. It must be the same*, because there can be no more any *medium* between sin and righteousness, or between being right and being wrong in a moral sense, than there can be a medium between straight and crooked in a natural sense." In fact, this very illustration was employed by some of the older Calvinists. And yet those brethren who complain of this view as heretical, profess to entertain on all topics in dispute the very doctrine of the Reformation; and they are very much alarmed lest that doctrine should be subverted by those who, it now appears, with the greatest strictness and accuracy maintain it.

4. The following strikes us as a much more alarming deviation from the principles of primitive Calvinism, than any yet referred to. The sentiment has been advanced, and has been, like the preceding, very extensively endorsed, that *Adam was not created righteous*. This has been openly and without contradiction (as yet), conceded to Pelagians and Socinians, that "*Adam was not righteous*." * And we regret to be compelled, by our impartiality as a historian, to say that this sentiment is attempted to be justified by the same mode of reasoning resorted to by Dr. Taylor of Norwich in maintenance of the same principle. That this may be fully manifest to the reader,

The very concluding sentence proves it: 'In the very passages adduced by the prosecutor on this charge, I have taught that God admits the sinner to favor, and treats him as if he had not sinned, or were righteous.' *Here is a reiteration (says Dr. Junkin) of the very error charged, that not sinning and righteousness are the same thing.*" *Vindication*, p. 135.

* See "*Vindication*," p. 135.

we give the language referred to, and place in juxtaposition to it that of Dr. Taylor.

1. *The language of Dr. Junkin.*

"Now innocence is freedom from guilt,—the state and condition of a moral being who has not transgressed. It is rather a negative than a positive quality or condition. Adam, the moment of his creation, was innocent. Righteousness implies positive quality, activity in compliance with law; and if the law prescribed a course, and proposed a reward, the compliance must cover the whole course,—the obedience must be entire and positive, in order to its being entitled to the reward. Adam had rectitude of nature and was innocent, but he was not righteous."^{*}

2. *The language of Dr. John Taylor.*

"Adam could not be originally created in righteousness and true holiness, because habits of holiness cannot be created, without our knowledge, concurrence, or consent; for holiness, in its nature, implies the choice and consent of a moral agent, without which it cannot be holiness."[†]

It was against this tenet that Edwards directed the powers of his mighty mind. See *Orig. Sin*, Part II. Chap. I. Sect. 1. *Works*, Vol. II. p. 406—417. Even John Wesley, in his "*Original Sin*," and Richard Watson, in his "*Theological Institutes*," not only refute it, but speak of the principle with the utmost abhorrence. These men, though Arminians, viewed the principle as opposed not so much to any particular system, as in direct contravention of the gospel itself.

The earlier history, also, of this sentiment, is sufficient to stamp it with suspicion in the minds of Calvinists. Just as it is expressed in the foregoing quotations, it is almost the *ipsissima verba* of the Polish Socinians, who flourished contemporaneously with the Reformers. They were the most strenuous as well as the ablest opponents of Calvinistic theology that its advocates have ever had to contend with. In proof of the identity of their language with that above quoted, we cite the *Confession of Faith* approved by their churches. It is entitled *Compendium Socinianismi*. The title of Chapter II. is *De statu primi hominis ante lapsum*, that is, *Of man's primitive state before the fall*: and Section I. thus reads: "Our churches teach that Adam was created truly good, and without sin, Gen. i. Eccles. vii. Yet not with any original righteousness; seeing that this is perfectly voluntary, and not natural. It is what the

* "*Vindication*," ut sup.

† "*Original Sin*."

man might have obtained by obedience if he had wished it, yet the thing itself he had not." *

The reader cannot but be forcibly impressed with the striking contrast between the preceding quotations and the pointed condemnation of both their *sentiment* and *phraseology* by the reformers. We will add only one brief specimen of the kind, from the admirable *Syntagma* of one of the most celebrated of the Calvinistic reformers. His words are: *Damnamus Osiandrum*, qui primum hominem ex creatione justum, neque injustum fuisse asseruit: that is, "*We condemn Osiander, who asserts that the first man was neither righteous nor unrighteous by creation.*" *Syntag. Tileni*. Soc. 33. Thes. 44. p. 211. Osiander's doctrines were expressly written against by Calvin, Ursinus, and all their celebrated orthodox contemporaries.

[The remaining two sections of this Article, viz. *The Views of the Reformers on Faith and the Active Obedience of Christ*, are deferred for the want of room in the present No. of the Repository. They have been prepared with much labor and research, and contain a portion of dogmatic history, which is well suited to exert a corrective influence in some parts of the American churches at the present time.—EDITOR.]

* "*Ecclesiae*] Docent illum [scil. Adamum] fuisse creatum a Deo bonum quidem et absque vitiis, Gen. i. Eccl. vii. Non tamen cum aliqua originali justitia: cum haec sit perfectio voluntaria, non naturalis, quam homo poterat quidem si voluisset, obediendo comparare sed reipsa tamen non habebat."

ARTICLE VI.

HEBREW LEXICOGRAPHY.

Hebraisches und chaldaisches Schulwörterbuch über das alte Testament, mit Hinweisung auf die Sprachlehren von Gesenius und Ewald, von J. H. R. Biesenthal. *Berlin*, 1837. Natorff u. Comp.

A Complete Hebrew and English Critical and Pronouncing Dictionary, on a New and Improved Plan, containing all the words in the Holy Bible [*sic*], both Hebrew and Chaldee, with the vowel points, prefixes and affixes, as they stand in the original text: together with their derivation, literal and etymological meaning, as it occurs in every part of the Bible, and illustrated by numerous citations from the Targums, Talmud and cognate dialects. By W. L. Roy, Professor of Oriental Languages in New York. *New York*, 1837. Collins, Keese & Co.

Reviewed by Dr. I. Nordheimer, Prof. of Oriental Languages in the University of the city of New York.

It may with confidence be asserted, that in no respect have the recent improvements in the science of philology been more fruitful in practical results, than in the interesting and highly important department of lexicography. In former times a lexicon was a mere magazine, in which the words of a language, together with their respective meanings were collected with a greater or less degree of care, but with no other system than an alphabetical arrangement, and without any attempt to seek out the hidden bond of connection running through entire families of words which is indicated both by their form and signification. Much less did it occur to the minds of the early lexicographers, to investigate either the mode in which words are formed from others already in existence for the purpose of expressing nearly related ideas, or that in which the often numerous and apparently widely different meanings of a single term have grown out of the unique idea which it was primarily intended to convey. These investigations, which constitute the very soul of modern lexicography, were then almost entirely overlooked; latterly however they have profitably exercised the powers of some of the acutest and most philosophic minds; and the result has been, that lexicons continue more and more to assume the character of scientific productions.

At the present day, therefore, no lexicographer can justly claim to have advanced the study of a language unless his work both in its contents and general plan shall prove him to have entered upon his task with comprehensive and philosophical views of language in general, and with both the will and the ability to execute it in accordance with those natural principles which are disclosed by a profound study of the infinitely diversified forms of human speech. The lexicographer must enter upon his undertaking firmly impressed with the conviction that a language is not a mere mass of unconnected phenomena, the results of a blind chance, but is the true and lively representative of the human soul ; and that, as the soul of man is in all times and situations subject to much the same impressions, and as its operations are regulated by never varying laws, the languages of all nations, which are the immediate results of its movements, must bear throughout the stamp of uniformity.

The full development of this fundamental truth is owing to the indefatigable researches of modern philologists, who have not suffered themselves to be deterred by the striking differences which the structure of individual languages presents, from endeavoring to discover the internal principle by which each is connected to one vast whole. The secret of their success is to be found in the fact, that they carried their inquiries beyond the mere outward form of language, and subjected to a rigid scrutiny its hidden sources. By this means they were enabled to prove to demonstration, that phenomena both lexicographical and grammatical of the most opposite character are frequently the best evidences of the radical nature of the connection existing between all languages, and furthermore that the occurrence of such apparent discrepancies might have been predicted from the very constitution of speech.

In granting the faculty of speech to be a necessary part of the nature which man has received from the hand of the Almighty, we acknowledge in effect that, even should it never become externally manifest in the shape of articulate sounds, its virtual existence is rendered coëval with that of man by the creation of the mental powers requisite for its production. This internal speech or language of the soul usually obtains an external existence through the medium of the organs of speech : yet should this be prevented by the malformation or total want of one or more of these organs, some other mode of communication will be substituted, such as gesticulation, the touch, etc. ;

thus showing that the productive energy of the soul constantly remains, although deprived of the usual mode of exhibiting its effects. When, however, no such difficulty occurs, and the organs are capable of freely seconding every impulse of the soul, the latter, as soon as excited by the impressions made on it by the external world, manifests a disposition to exercise its powers in the production of audible speech. As the operations of the soul and the movements of the organs admit of indefinite modification, the articulate sounds which are their joint production exhibit an almost endless variety, and this is still further increased by the combination of the individual sounds into words. Thus, although audible speech is in the main a faithful transcript of the sensations and reflections of the mind, the immense variety in the external circumstances of nations, as well as in their mental development and cultivation, constitutes a fruitful source of diversity in the very outset of the formation of language—a diversity which is increased *ad infinitum* by the reaction of the external world immediately succeeding the embodying of the language of the soul in words, and which results in the formation of dialects and sometimes of independent languages.

When a word has experienced the effects of all the influences brought to bear upon it during its gradual formation, it obtains a place in the world of language together with its inherent idea, the two bearing to each other the mutual relation of body and soul. The path thus laid open by the mind for the communication of an idea is naturally sought by it again on the recurrence of the impression, by which it was first excited to action, and in this manner the primitive word obtains a permanent existence. It, however, still remains subject to the influences both internal and external which affected its formation; and hence, although created to be the sole representative of a single idea, it is liable to changes both in its material structure and in its animating principle. Thus, essential alterations in the form of a primitive may gradually be produced by the repeated change or suppression of one or more of its elements arising from defective organization or imperfect recollection, while the *idea* which the word is intended to convey retains its original character without any modification whatever. When such changes in form have reached a certain amount, a new dialect is the result. Changes in the *signification* of primitive words may be produced by alterations in the physical or social

position of individuals or nations, in consequence of which their impressions assume a character differing more or less widely from that which they originally bore. The most direct and easy expedient, and consequently that most usually adopted, for expressing the modified feelings to which a new condition of things gives rise, is, not to undertake the construction of new terms, but to employ those already in existence for the expression of such ideas as their original most nearly resembles : and thus a word which was created to represent a single idea may gradually become the exponent of many others standing to it in various degrees of relation. From each of these secondary meanings new ones may branch out, until at length the only mode in which the connection between the primary meaning of a word and its remotest applications can be rendered obvious, is to trace out the path followed by the mind in deducing the latter from the former. It will not unfrequently be found that the intermediate significations have fallen out of use ; but as without these the exhibition of the powers and uses of a word must ever remain incomplete, there hence arises the necessity for their restoration as far as practicable ; and this may truly be said to constitute one of the most difficult and delicate of all the arduous duties which the lexicographer is called upon to perform.

In order to accomplish this in a manner to satisfy himself and benefit those who may adopt his work as a guide, if the language of which he treats be already extinct, it is requisite that he should render himself acquainted with all its most important remains, as these are the most authentic sources of information to which he can possibly refer ; but should it be still in use and rich in the treasures of literature, the abundance of materials thus furnished will impose upon him the additional task of tracing its history down from the remotest periods to which he can have access, and of showing what words and what acceptations of words have come into use and been again rejected in all the different stages of its existence : for

“ *Ut silvae foliis pronos mutantur in annos,
Prima cadunt, ita verborum vetus interit aetas.*”

Again, as a language when it first attracts the lexicographer's attention may have already arrived at that state in which the meanings of a single word have often no visible interconnection in consequence of the disappearance of the intermediate shades of signification, and which the utmost familiarity with that language alone will not suffice to restore, the lexicographer who

desires properly to perform this portion of his task must apply himself to the attainment of such a knowledge of its cognate dialects as may enable him to consult them with facility ; and when these fail in furnishing the information required, he must have recourse to languages possessing no other relation to the subject of his labors than that which all the varieties of human speech bear to one another in consequence of their community of origin and design. The labors which the lexicographer is thus called upon to perform may well be termed Herculean ; yet he alone who has mastered the peculiarities of a variety of languages, whose powers of observation have been sharpened by constant use, and who possesses a judgment capable of weighing with scrupulous exactness the value of conflicting testimonies, can perform the part of one in a manner to satisfy the claims which will be made upon him by the present advanced state of the science of philology.

In addition to what has now been stated, there remains another difficulty for the lexicographer to overcome. We have already seen that instead of constructing a new term for the representation of a new idea, the same object is frequently effected in a readier manner by employing a word existing in the language whose signification is nearly related to the idea for which an exponent is desired. When however this new idea, although bearing a radical affinity to one which has already attained its expression, is so far removed from it as to render the above expedient insufficient for the purposes of perspicuity, another step in derivation is taken, which consists in modifying or altogether rejecting one or more of the elements of the original word or in making an addition to their number. In this manner from a comparatively few primitives are produced a multitude of new terms bearing a resemblance to their respective originals both in form and signification. So that the lexicographer, after having discovered and systematically arranged the various shades of meaning assumed by each separate word, has to select the primitive from a mass of words bearing to one another an obvious relation, and then to show the manner in which the derivatives have been formed, and the means whereby they are rendered capable of adequately representing those modifications of the original idea which they are intended to convey.*

* For a more complete development of the writer's ideas on this subject, see the preface to his *Hebrew Grammar*, pp. xi. et seqq.

We have already shown that the discovery of the primary meaning of a word, and the tracing of the connection between it and its sometimes numerous secondary significations, is frequently rendered so difficult by the disappearance of those which were intermediate, that the possession of the acutest reasoning powers aided by the most comprehensive views of language will not invariably ensure success. This holds true, and to a still greater extent, of the attempt to find out and exhibit the connection between the various derivatives from a single root—an attempt whose difficulty is sometimes rendered almost insurmountable from the multiplicity of changes both internal and external, to which words are subjected in the process of derivation, and furthermore from the fact that the primitive word itself frequently becomes lost, and thus leaves them without any common point of reference. Here comparative philology comes to the aid of the lexicographer, by presenting him from the cognate languages, and sometimes from those which are more remote, the roots and significations which have disappeared from that which forms the subject of his labors. Yet the lexicographer must be careful in an especial degree to guard against the error, so prevalent at the present day, of hunting out far-fetched illustrations from foreign tongues, to the neglect of those sources of information which each language presents in greater or less abundance for the explanation of its own phenomena.

The above are the principal points to which the lexicographer must direct his attention in the illustration of words separately considered; but as in actual speech they are placed together in every possible kind of relation, it becomes necessary likewise to state the various modifications of meaning which thence result, together with the manner in which they are produced.

Let us now briefly sum up the duties which the lexicographer of the present day is called upon to perform. First he must collect all the shades of signification pertaining to each individual word, arranging them in the order in which they arose, and explaining on philological grounds the mode in which one has proceeded from the other. In addition to this historical developement of particular words, he must point out the primitive of each group or family of words, showing in what manner its derivatives were formed from it, and by what means they are enabled to convey their respective meanings as modifications of

the original idea. Finally, he must indicate the variations of meaning to which a word is liable when construed with others, and point out the mode in which these variations are produced. Should the lexicographer have fully met these requisitions, whose fulfilment the advanced state of philological science so absolutely demands, he may rest under the conviction of having completed his undertaking, and answered all reasonable expectations. And should he, without failing in any of these essentials, proceed still further, and exhibit the wonderful connection existing between languages that have heretofore been regarded as containing little or nothing in common, he will communicate to his reader both instruction and delight, while to himself may be applied the words of Horace :

“Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci.”

Having now given in outline the objects whose attainment the lexicographer should propose to himself, and having enumerated the excellencies which at present so happily characterize the lexicons of the classical and of many modern tongues, we will now turn to our principal subject, the lexicography of the Hebrew, and endeavor to show in how far the existing lexicons of this language come up to the requirements of the age. And it may well form a subject of self-congratulation to every lover of this venerable tongue, which for twenty-three centuries has existed only in books, and the scantiness of whose remains so much enhances the difficulties inevitably attending the acquisition of a dead language, that its lexicography now stands upon a footing equal if not superior to that of the Latin or the Greek itself.

For this pleasing state of things we are mainly indebted to the critical mind, the vast erudition, and the unwearied exertions of Wilhelm Gesenius, who, having applied himself from his earliest youth with uninterrupted assiduity to the pursuit of Oriental learning in all its branches, and being surrounded by his situation with “every implement and means of art,” has placed himself foremost in the ranks of Hebrew lexicographers, and, by the perspicuity of his writings, the depth and accuracy of his researches, and a felicitous use of the materials so abundantly furnished him by his predecessors, Kimchi, Buxtorf, Simonis, Winer, and others, has raised this department of Oriental philology, which he has made so peculiarly his own, to the high pitch of excellence it now exhibits.

Notwithstanding the high tone of commendation we have here employed in reference to Gesenius, and which we feel is scarcely adequate to express those feelings of generous admiration which the literary character of this distinguished scholar is calculated to excite in every mind capable of appreciating real merit, we do not mean to assert that he has absolutely left no room for further improvement. On the contrary, we are of opinion that the etymological comparisons which he has instituted between the Hebrew and other languages, especially those of the Indo-European stock, although exhibiting a fund of ingenuity and learning, are susceptible of being extended much further, and that many families of words which he has attributed to two or three distinct stems might with propriety be reünited and arranged under a single primitive. It is not however our intention to enter at present into the history of Hebrew lexicography, or to point out precisely how far and in what respects Gesenius has been enabled to improve upon the labors of his predecessors, or in what his own may be regarded as deficient ; since his work has been rendered accessible to all by means of the accurate translation of Professor Robinson reviewed in the twenty-fourth No. of this journal. We therefore proceed at once to a consideration of the respective merits of the two works whose titles are placed at the head of this article, and which, having but recently appeared, have not yet, it may be presumed, become known to the public in general. This we will do with all candor and impartiality, bearing in mind the celebrated saying of Pythagoras :

“ ἦν σὺ κακῶς δικάσης σε θεὸς μετέπειτα δικάσει.”

Both of these works we have examined with some care. The former, written in German and published in Germany, is called a “*School Dictionary* ;” accordingly we expected to find it defective in some particulars, and containing few or no essential improvements on the larger works that had preceded it. The latter, written in English and published in America, bears the imposing title of “*A Complete Critical and Pronouncing Dictionary on a New and Improved Plan* ;” leading us to anticipate that in it the deficiencies of former lexicons would be at least in some degree supplied. The result, however, as is not unfrequently the case when judgments are based upon mere externals, has proved entirely the reverse of our expectations.

On proceeding with our examination, we found the School

Dictionary to be a work according completely in its general features with the latest results of philology, and executed with admirable accuracy in its details, while on every page its author exhibits a perfect familiarity with every department of Hebrew literature both biblical and rabbinical, a knowledge of the kindred dialects as uncommon as it is desirable, and that inquiring and philosophical turn of mind the want of which no extent of mere learning can supply. All these advantages have combined to bestow on M. Biesenthal's work a character that will enable it to bear a favorable comparison with the much admired lexicon of Gesenius itself. In fine, this work so unpretending in its appearance, while well calculated to become the tyro's guide through the intricacies of the language, is also capable of communicating much that is new and interesting to the critical scholar, and may justly be regarded as a most important addition to the treasures of Hebrew lexicography.

The Complete Critical and Pronouncing Dictionary appears on the contrary to have been undertaken on no settled principle whatever, while its entire execution betrays a degree of carelessness unpardonable in a work of the kind, and, what is of still greater consequence, an almost total ignorance, not only of the Shemitish languages in general, but even of the first principles of Hebrew grammar. In short the book, instead of being a desirable acquisition to Oriental philology, will prove, if not cast at once into its merited obscurity, a reproach to the literary character of the country in which it was produced.

The expression of unqualified disapprobation is painful in the extreme; and the reviewer would here state once for all, that nothing but a sense of duty to the public, combined with the urgent solicitations of some of the most zealous promoters of sound learning, could have induced him to take upon himself the invidious task of placing before the world in its true colors so audacious a piece of charlatanism. He will now proceed to a more particular description of the principal features of M. Biesenthal's work; after which he will adduce some examples in support of his assertions, and compare with them the corresponding portions of the Dictionary of Mr. Roy.

The chief object which the author of the School Dictionary had in view, was to furnish the students in the gymnasia of Germany with a manual containing the sum of all that is valuable in the latest discoveries in Hebrew lexicography without detailing the steps by which they have been arrived at, and

which should thus hold a middle rank between a mere vocabulary and the elaborate production of Gesenius, for whose use the beginner is not yet prepared. Were this the whole extent of M. Biesenthal's labors, he would deserve the thanks of all lovers of Oriental literature for removing from the hands of the student those skeleton dictionaries which can afford him no real insight into the formation of the language, and at the same time relieving him from the necessity of perusing the entire history of a word in all its ramifications before he can arrive at the meaning which forms the object of his search. The author of the *School Dictionary*, however, has done more than this. Uniting as he does a profound knowledge of his subject to a penetrating mind, he has frequently been enabled to bring together roots with their inherent ideas which Gesenius and his predecessors had regarded as totally unconnected, (see for example the words *חָזַק* and *חָצַר* below.) He has also succeeded in a number of cases in discovering the primary signification of a word within the limits of the Hebrew itself, where others have thought it necessary to have recourse to the Syriac or Arabic, and in thence deducing the secondary meanings in a manner so natural and perspicuous as at once to delight the critical reader and afford a grateful assistance to the student's recollection (see *חָזַק* below.) In order that his work may afford to the learner not yet familiar with the details of the grammar every assistance, its author has given at the head of each article all the parts of imperfect verbs which occur in the Bible, the construct state of nouns singular and plural, and the form assumed by these latter on the reception of suffixes (see below the verbs *חָזַק*, *חָצַר*, *חָרַה*, etc. and the nouns *חָזַק* and *חָצַר*.) He has likewise been careful to note in every instance the position of the accent, and has constantly pointed out with far greater minuteness than any of his predecessors, Gesenius not excepted—the number of times and the places in which uncommon forms occur, with copious references to the smaller Hebrew grammars of Gesenius and Ewald and to the Chaldee grammar of Winer. Another distinguishing excellence of the work consists in the scrupulous accuracy employed in indicating the various shades of meaning presented by verbs according to the particles with which they are construed; a particular in which Hebrew lexicography is already so much indebted to Gesenius (see *חָזַק*, *חָרַה*, etc. below.) In the definition of words, in addition to the published works of the most eminent Jewish lexicographers and commen-

tators and the accumulated labors of Christian scholars from Buxtorf to Gesenius, the author has consulted a valuable manuscript lexicon of Menahhem ben S'ruk, hitherto unedited, which is preserved in the royal library at Berlin. We will now present the reader with the means of forming a judgment for himself by making a few extracts with accompanying remarks from the body of M. Biesenthal's work.

The words **עוֹלָם** *duration of life, world*, and **חֹמֶר** *mole*, are derived by Simonis and after him by Gesenius from two separate roots, Arab. **خَلَد** *to last, to endure*, and Syr. **ܕܥܠܡܐ** *to dig*; and thus we lose the analogy of the words **עוֹלָם** and **עוֹלָם**, the latter of which, according to Gesenius, is from the root **עוֹל**: thus **עוֹל** *to conceal*, from which **עוֹלָם** *the hidden*, and hence *the distant, long lasting*, as time, the world. This discrepancy, however, is avoided by M. Biesenthal, who derives from the obsolete Hebrew root **עוֹל** *to hide away, conceal*, preserved in Rabbinic, both **עוֹלָם** *the hidden, remote*, hence *time, the world* (like **עוֹלָם**), and **חֹמֶר** *a mole*, i. e. one *hidden* in the earth. The correctness of the latter view is advocated not only by the superior simplicity of deducing both words from a single indigenous root, but also by the analogy thus shown to exist in the formation of the two synonymous terms **עוֹלָם** and **עוֹלָם**. The same analogy is exhibited by the Arabic **عَالَمٌ** and **عَالَمٌ** *age, eternity*, from the equivalent roots **عَالَمٌ** and **عَالَمٌ** *to endure*. With these might be united the Hebrew **אָבָד** *to be lost, to perish*, termed by Golius and Freytag the converse of **אָבָד**: for the idea of being hidden or lost may be regarded in two opposite points of view, either of becoming utterly lost, perishing, as the Heb. **אָבָד**, or of losing itself in the extent of its duration, as the Arab. **عَالَمٌ**.

In page 234, col. 1, of the Dictionary of Mr. Roy, we read as follows: "**חֹמֶר** *A weasel, or small, creeping animal*. m. s. Lev. 11: 29, **חֹמֶר**" (in this word there are three mistakes: the first letter Hheth is a medial instead of an initial, the vowel accompanying the word should be Petocho (◌) not Sekopho (◌), and this should be placed not on the first radical but on the second, thus **חֹמֶר**). "In

Syr. *to creep, or steal upon a person softly, imperceptibly.*" (We have no hesitation in affirming all that part of the statement which follows the word "or" to be a gratuitous addition of the author's). Hence **רָחַץ** " (here are two mistakes: both **ר** and **ח** should be pointed with (**ֿ**), thus **רָחִץ** as in Ps. 17: 14. 39: 6; the first (**ֿ**) is changed into (**ֿ**) only in those cases where the word receives a pause-accent) "*the world, or time, which passes away unnoticed, as a dream when one awaketh.*" So that **רָחַץ** "*the world, time,*" is derived from **רָחַץ** "*a weasel or creeping animal,*" because the world creeps away! The Rabbinic derivation of this word is so much on a par with that of Mr. Roy, that we cannot resist the temptation of presenting it for the reader's further edification. There was, say they, a council called of the princes of the world, to consult on the best method of administration. The ruler of the sea complained that he had not subjects enough. He was accordingly allowed to seek some from the earth, on condition of providing them with food. Thereupon he cast all the land animals into the sea, with the command that they should there propagate their species. And hence the saying, that every creature of the land is to be found also in the sea, although some have been made to assume the forms of monsters. But when it came to the weasel's turn, she standing on the shore said to the prince of the sea, "Why must I throw myself into the sea again? do you not perceive," pointing to her reflection in the water, "that I am already there?" The prince, satisfied with this, dismissed the weasel. Hence say the Talmudists every land animal is to be found in the sea, except the weasel who escaped by her cunning. On this account the earth is called **רָחַץ**, as the weasel (**רָחַץ**) alone remains peculiar to it! (Buxt. Lex. Chald. Talm. et Rab. col. 756).

We entirely concur in the opinion of M. Biesenthal, that the meaning of the next root **חָלַץ** is *to be weak, sick*; and accordingly reject the far-fetched comparison of Gesenius with the Arabic **حَلَى** *dulcis et suavis fuit, amavit*, from the primary meaning *to rub, to polish*: this he appears to have made with the view of illustrating the Pihel **חָלַץ** which he explains *to stroke* as the face or beard, and hence *to flatter*! We will extract the entire article from the School

Dictionary, as a fair specimen of the philosophical acumen and clearness of arrangement which reign throughout the work.

“ חָלָה inf. חָלִיתָ fut. apoc. וַיִּחָל and וַיִּחָל 1. to be weak, faint, powerless. 2. to be sick אֶחָד-רִגְלָיו חָלָה to be diseased in the feet. חוֹלָה אֶהְיֶה I am sick of love. רָעָה חוֹלָה a sore evil. 3. to be afflicted, disturbed, with עַל about any thing. *Niph.* 1 pers. נִחְלִיתִי 3 pers. נִחְלִי part. fem. נִחְלָה, נִחְלָה 1. to become weak, exhausted, powerless. מַקְדָּה נִחְלָה a wound difficult to heal. 2. to be troubled, disturbed, with עַל about any thing. Am. 6: 6. *Pi'hal* חָלָה inf. חָלִיתָ imp. חָל pl. חָלוּ fut. (?) 1. to make sick. Ps. 77: 11. 2. to impose sickness upon one, with בְּ Deut. 29: 21. 3. to weaken = soften something; hence חָלָה פָּנָי פֶּלַח to soften one's countenance (anger), comp. חֲסָדִיר פָּנִים Is. 53: 3. Ezek. 27: 35, and נִשָּׂא פָּנָי; חָלָה פָּנָי יְיָ to soften Jehovah's face (anger), to seek his grace. Ps. 45: 13; עֲשִׂירֵי עָשִׂירֵי עָם the rich of the people shall soften thy countenance. *Pu'hal* חָלִיתָ pass. to be weakened. Is. 14: 10. *Hiph.* חָלָה (Syr. form for חָלָה) 1 pers. חָלָה 1. to aggravate, as a wound. 2. to contract a disorder = make one's self sick. Hos. 7: 5 : *on the day of our king* חָלָה שָׂרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ *the princes make themselves sick from the heat of wine.* Others : *the princes empty the skins of wine.* חָלָה (חָלָה?) Vulg. *coeperunt furere a vino*, according to the vowels חָלָה... חָלָה. 3. to be afflicted. *Hoph.* חָלִיתָ to be wounded. *Hithp.* inf. חָלָה, imp. חָלָה fut. apoc. in pause וַיִּחָל 1. to become sick. 2. simulative : to feign one's self sick. p. 138, 9, 10. 139, 16. § 370, 1) 373, 1. 2. 392 β.”

Turn we now to Mr. Roy's exposition of the same verb. “ חָלָה 1. *He was faint, weak, exhausted, etc.* ; 2. *in pain, or great distress* ; 3. *was grieved, afflicted, persecuted*” (the reader will observe that the meanings of the different species are jumbled together without distinction and almost without order) ; “ 4. *he supplicated, asked for mercy*” (we must charitably suppose that the connection between this and the previous meanings is so perfectly self-evident to the author that he considers any explanation unnecessary). Under the head “ 3. m. s. pret. K.” we have “ 1 Sam. 22 : 8,” where the word occurs only in the *participial* form. In 2 Chron. 16: 1, which is referred to as containing the future, the word does not appear in any

shape. In Jer. 12: 13, referred to for the Pi'hel, we find only the Niph'hal נִפְחַל. Next we have "Piail" (why repeated?), "Deut. 29: 22" (this should be 29: 21), and further down, "Hiph. 1 K. 22: 34" (the word is here in Hoph'hal). Proceeding to the next line, we find "As a n. m. s. נִפְחַל" (in this word are two typographical errors: פ should be pointed with (ֿ), and ל with (ֿ), thus נִפְחַל as in Deut. 28: 61). Among the affixes to this verbal noun we are presented with "ה-her" ("misfortunes never come singly," and accordingly here also are two mistakes: the vowel preceding ה is (ֿ) not (ֿ), and ה should contain a Mappik, thus הֿ); and this is followed by the enigmatical expression "f. s. const.," whose meaning is probably best known to the author. We have next "חֲלֹחִי *My infirmity, weakness*, f. s. Ps. 77: 11, for חֲלֹחִי, ה 3 Rad. drop. because of aff. חֲ compens. by dag." (in this passage are four misstatements: first, חֲלֹחִי is not a derivative noun, but is the regular inf. constr. Pi'hel of the חָלַח verb חָלַח; secondly, the author immediately contradicts himself by asserting that חֲלֹחִי is for חֲלֹחִי with the third radical dropped on account of the affix חֲ, whence it appears that he now regards it as the pret. Pi'hel with the affirmative חֲ of the first pers. sing. which however would be חֲלֹחִי not חֲלֹחִי: but in reality the word, as we have already observed, is the infin. constr. with the suffix יֿ of the first person; consequently ח is not a suffix, but the hardened form of the *third radical*! thirdly, the affirmative of the first pers. sing. pret. of חָלַח verbs is חֲ not חֲ; fourthly, as to the compensation of the third radical by Daghash in the *second*—for this is the only letter in the word bearing this point—we would merely suggest that this is the characteristic of the Pi'hel species). "Hence, *He declared it to be my infirmity*," etc. (the word here rendered "he declared" is וְאָמַר Ps. 77: 11, the *first* pers. sing. fut. with ו conv.) Let the reader compare this heterogeneous mass of absurdities with the masterly exposition of M. Biesenthal, and draw his own conclusions.

Another of the many instances in which we think the author of the School Dictionary to have happily reunited the parts of a root which Gesenius had separated is to be found in the two words חֲצִיר *court* and חֲצִיר *grass*; the former of these is derived by Gesenius from the Arabic حَصَرَ *to enclose, surround*, and the latter from

חָצֵר to be green, to flourish (viruit). Both words are referred by M. Biesenthal to a single obsolete Hebrew root חָצַר bearing the same meaning with its cognates חָצַץ = קָצַר = קָצַץ, viz. *to divide, cut off*, hence חָצִיר *grass*, that which is cut down, and חָצֵר *front court*, that which is cut off, separated. We could wish that he had proceeded a little further, and had noticed the connection between *grass* and *court*—a place separated from the public ground by an enclosure and hence producing grass; which would have united the two Arabic roots حَضَرَ to hedge about and خَضَرَ to be green. We will here give the article on חָצֵר, as a favorable specimen of the author's mode of treating the nouns.

“חָצֵר com., constr. חָצֵר, with suff. חָצֵרִי; pl. חָצֵרִים, with suff. חָצֵרֵי, and fem. חָצֵרוֹת, constr. חָצֵרוֹת, with suff. חָצֵרוֹתֵי. 1. court-yard. חָצֵר הַפְּנִימִית the inner (priests') court of the temple. 2. hamlet, village; used also of the moveable tent-villages of the nomads. Is. 42: 11. It is used in composition to form many names of places, viz. (a) חָצֵר-אַדָּר a place on the border of the tribe of Judah. Num. 34: 4. (b) חָצֵר סוּסִים and חָצֵר סוּסִים (Horse-court) in the tribe of Simeon. Josh. 19: 5. 1 Chron. 4: 31. (c) חָצֵר עֵינָן and חָצֵר עֵינָן (Fountain-court) on the borders of northern Palestine. Num. 34: 9. (d) חָצֵר שִׁדְעָל (Fox-court) in the tribe of Simeon. Neh. 11: 27. (e) חָצֵר הַחֵיכּוֹן (Middle-court) on the border of Hauran. Ezek. 47: 16. (f) plur. חָצֵרוֹת a camping-place of the Israelites. Num. 11: 35.”

On turning to the “Complete Dictionary,” we find “חָצִיר *grass, leeks, young grain*” (!). One of the three references given is “Is. 15: 16;” this chapter has but nine verses, and the word appears in the *sixth*. The word חָצֵר the reader will seek for in vain, but in lieu thereof he is presented with “חָצֵר” (that this cannot be laid to the printer's charge, is shown by the annexed pronunciation “cha-tzar;” of this another specimen occurs a little further down, where we have “חָצֵר-מִנָּה cha-tzar-mo-weth” for מִנָּה ma-weth). “A court, or open place, set apart for public business.” “Ps. 104: 4” (here the word does not occur).

The attention paid by M. Biesenthal to the development of the significations of verbs as affected by the various particles with which they are construed will be seen in the following article on חָרַה.

“**חָרָה** fut. **יִחַרְהוּ** apoc. **יִחַר** 1. to burn, used only of anger; with **אֵף** anger, or elliptically (§ 573) as Ps. 18: 8: **חָרָה לוֹ** *he burned* (es entbrannte ihm) scil. *with anger*, **חָרָה בְּעֵינָי פֶּלֶא** *one burned in the eyes* = as though his eyes glowed *with rage*; with **בְּ** against one, usually with **לְ** of the person and **עַל** of the object, less often with **אֶל**. *Niph.* 3 pl. **נִחָרוּ** Job 1: 6. Part. pl. **נִחָרִים** Is. 41: 11, to be angry, with **בְּ** with one. *Hiph.* **חָרָה** fut. apoc. **יִחַרְהוּ** 1. to let or cause anger to burn. Job 19: 11. 2. to be ardent, zealous. *Tiph.* fut. 2 pers. **תִּחַרְהָ** Part. **מִתְחַרְהָ** to enrage one's self, to contend, with **אֶת** with one. Jer. 12: 5. 22: 15. *Hithp.* fut. apoc. **תִּחַרְהוּ** to enrage, irritate one's self. Ps. 37: 1.”

On this word the “Critical Dictionary” has as follows: “**חָרָה** 1. *He was irritated*, etc.; 2. *fretful*, etc.; 3. *zealous*, etc. Neh. 3: 20,” (by what rule of preference is the third signification, which is that of the *Hiph.* species, favored with a reference which is refused to the two first?) “3. m. s. Pret. K. reg.” (this is an error, as according to the common phraseology adopted by Mr. Roy the verbs **חָרָה** are *irregular*). “F. Exod. 32: 1,” (it occurs in the *eleventh* verse of this chapter, but not in the first,) “12” (the only word from the root **חָרָה** which appears in this verse is, not the future of the verb, but the *noun* **חֲרוֹן**).

The ingenious suggestion of M. Biesenthal with regard to the obscure word **חָרָה** *sun*, is well worthy of notice. This word he supposes to have arisen by transposition from **סָרַח** = **זָרַח** *to rise*, as the sun, and cites in support of his opinion the proper noun **חֲמַנָה** *sun* or **סָרַח חֲמַנָה** Judg. 2: 9. Josh. 19: 50. 24: 30, and the words **חָרָה** Job 9: 7, which he regards as an instance of paronomasia. The opinion of Gesenius, however, who considers the primitive idea to be that of *dryness, heat*, and the root **חָרָה** an instance of the change of **ר** into **ס** for **חָרָה**, is by no means destitute of probability; the commutation of the letters *r* and *s* being of frequent and universal occurrence, e. g. Germ. *war, eisen, hase*, Eng. *was, iron, hare*.

Turning to this root in the “Dictionary on a New and Improved Plan,” we meet with the following: “**חָרָה**, in Arab. **حَرَسَا**” (this word is even more than commonly unfortunate: it contains an initial instead of a medial *Re*, a medial instead of an initial *Shin*, and

a final Elif instead of nothing at all ; the word **חַרְשָׁא** can only be the accusative of the noun of action **חַרְשָׁ** or **חַרְשָׁ**, the verbal root of which is **חָרַשׁ**. “*To animate, enliven, stir up, be active, lively, vigilant*” (as neither Golius, Castell, nor Freytag has been able to discern any one of these meanings in the word **חַרְשָׁ**, we are under the necessity of awarding to Mr. Roy the entire credit of their invention). “As a n. m. s. **חָרַשׁ**” (**ח** should have (**חַ**), as in Job 9: 7, which is changed into (**חַ**) only when accompanied by a pause-accent).

The few extracts we have made from the letter **ח** will suffice we think to justify the opinions we have expressed concerning the merits of the School Dictionary. At the same time it were much to be desired, that its author had carried out more fully his idea of reuniting when possible those roots which previous lexicographers have divided without sufficient reason. Thus the root **חָנַח**, which Gesenius has separated into two parts, the first signifying *to be foolish*, the second *to desire, to attempt to go*, might we think easily be shown to bear a close relation to the Arabic **وَأَن** *to flee, to hasten*, whence **وَأَن** *first, foremost* ; from which is naturally derived the idea of acting with haste or inconsiderateness, and hence *foolishly*. The hastening or pushing of one's self forward, so characteristic of youth, is closely connected and especially by the grave Orientals with the idea of folly, while the deliberateness of movement peculiar to age is united in our minds with the notion of wisdom. This union of haste and folly is expressed in the forcible German proverbs, “*Der Narr ist immer vorn an*,” “*Mit dem Narren macht man Bahn*.” We could also have wished that M. Biesenthal had devoted some share of his attention to the comparison of the Hebrew with other languages ; for, although his work is designed principally to be a student's manual, we agree with the opinion expressed by Gesenius in the preface to his smaller Grammar, that the exhibition of the relations which a language bears to others is an excellent means of keeping alive an interest in the young philologist for the objects of his pursuit—an opinion, be it said, which applies with greater pro-

priety to lexicography than to grammar. The author could easily have materially increased the interest and utility of his work, by giving at the end of each article the results of those comparisons in which Gesenius may be considered to have attained complete success. This, however, his desire for originality in all likelihood forbade.

We will now devote a short space to a consideration of the general character of the Complete Dictionary, although we fear that the reader like ourselves is already heartily disgusted with the subject; for, as the book is a native production, it behooves us once for all to make its real character completely known. The first point to which the attention is naturally directed on taking into consideration the character of a work is its general *plan*; but as we candidly confess our inability to discover in the present instance aught deserving the name, we will briefly state what appears to have been the mode of its fabrication. The grand idea then of the author it appears was this: to copy from the Concordance all the forms of each word that occur in the Bible, and arrange them in the order of the alphabet, whether beginning with a radical or a servile letter. But this brilliant undertaking has not been crowned with success, as will sufficiently appear from the numerous deficiencies disclosed by a comparison of the first full page of the Dictionary with the lexicon of Gesenius, which we have made in compliance with the author's own proposal. In the first place, we find, agreeably to the alphabetical arrangement, the word **אֲבִיחַ** 2 m. s. pret. Pi'hel of **אָבַד**, but why is no mention made of the first pers. **אֲבִיחִי** Jer. 15: 7? again, why have we not **אֲבִיחֶךָ** Num. 17: 20, and with **ה** par. 3 Sam. 17: 1, and also **אֲבִיחָהּ** Ps. 44: 7. 55: 24, etc.? It is true that these are not made separate articles by Gesenius, but they should be so to carry out the alphabetical principle of Mr. Roy; the following independent words, however, occur in the Bible and consequently in Gesenius, although in the "Complete Dictionary" they will be sought for in vain; **אֲבִיחֶךָ** Esth. 9: 5, **אֲבִיחֶיךָ** 1 Sam. 9: 1, **אֲבִיחֶיךָ** Exod. 6: 24, **אֲבִיחֶיךָ** Exod. 9: 31. Jer. 2: 14, **אֲבִיחֶיךָ** Num. 1: 11. 2: 22, **אֲבִיחֶיךָ** Gen. 25: 4, **אֲבִיחֶיךָ** 1 Sam. 8: 2, **אֲבִיחֶיךָ** Jer. 10: 1. Words with **ו** conversive and conjunctive are of constant occurrence in almost every letter of the alphabet. The author states as one of the "superior advantages" of his Dictionary, that it will supply the place of a

concordance. He does not however appear to have the remotest idea of the real nature of such a work, the peculiar design of which is, not to give all the forms in which words occur together with their prefixes and suffixes, but to state in what places and in what connections they are found.

And even were the scheme of giving every word in the order of the alphabet completely carried into effect, its ridiculous absurdity will at once become apparent, when we reflect that were a verb conjugated through all the modes, tenses, and persons of all species, it would be necessary to insert it in not less than *one hundred* places, not including the prefixed particles. It is true, that no one verb is thus extensively employed; but we have examined the verb קָנָה in the Dictionary, and find that it occurs no less than *twenty-nine* times, while Gesenius in his lexicon has given it but a single place. The noun קֶנֶד is also made to form *seven* distinct articles. We are thus enabled to perceive whence the author derives the boast in his modest preface of having given "several thousand more words than Hebrew lexicons in general."

That the author is not familiar with even the characters of the Arabic and Syriac, is obvious from the fact that out of every twenty words from either of those languages not three are correct. As we have already exhibited some specimens of this, we will here confine our remarks to the Arabic and Syriac columns in the table of "Oriental Alphabets" placed at the beginning. As only one form of each letter is given in mutilated alphabets of this sort, which by the way are intended not for use but for show, initials only should be employed; yet we meet with four medials (ج , ك , س , ش) in the Arabic column, and one (ܟ) in the Syriac. In arranging the Arabic letters opposite the Hebrew, the author has made $\text{ج} = \text{ק}$ and $\text{ك} = \text{ק}$, the reverse of the truth. The initial ك (named Kaf) is properly placed opposite the Heb. כ ; while its medial form ك (named Kaf) is made to correspond to כ , the author evidently taking it for a different letter of the alphabet! The letter below this is Elif (ا) instead of Lam (ل). The Arabic س (Sin) is placed opposite to ש , and ش (Shin) to ש . In the Syriac column we have a final Yud (ܝ) instead of an initial Nun (ܢ).

We will now discuss, as briefly as possible, the claims of the book to "correctness and completeness in its definitions;" and that neither himself or others may accuse or suspect us of doing him the slightest injustice, we will speak only of the first verb (אָבַד) which occurs, and of the first word (יָרַע) to which the author requests our particular attention in this respect.

"אָבַד 1. *He perished, was lost, utterly destroyed*; 2. *went astray, departed from God*;" (this last signification is completely erroneous: we have indeed אָבַד צֶהָדָה *a lost sheep*, but the word אָבַד is never applied to man in the metaphorical sense here attributed to it;) "3. *became vain, empty, desolate, destitute*" (the product of the author's brain). Although synonymous and erroneous interpretations here as elsewhere have lent their aid to give an appearance of fullness to the definitions, the real uses even of the simple or Kal species are not all given, while those of Pi'hel and Hoph'hal are utterly neglected. We will proceed at once to the other parts of the article, dwelling on them as slightly as possible. "3. m. s. Pret. K. irreg. אָבַד Num. 17: 12." (not there) "Ps. 9: 67." (for 9: 6, 7; in the first of the two verses it occurs in the Pi'hel with the transitive signification *to destroy*), "Deut. 32: 28." (the word is here not a preterite but a *participle*) "Hiph. Num. 24: 9." (not there) "aff. הָ She" (it should be הָהּ). "Arab. أَب To perish, die. Kimki." (the amount of ignorance and presumption compressed within this small space is truly astonishing: the middle letter of the Arabic root should be an initial not a final Be, thus أَب; the meaning attributed to it is the direct reverse of the true one, which is *to last long, to endure*, and in support of it we are referred to *Kimki*! The fact is Kimchi never wrote an Arabic lexicon, and the Sepher Hashshorashim makes no mention of the word أَب) "תִּיבִירִיּוֹן Targ. Onk. on Deut. 33: 18." (incorrect). "As a n. f. s. אָבַדָה *A lost person*" (untrue: the word is applied to *things* only) "*destruction, perdition, the invisible state, the bottomless pit*" (all false). "Exod. 22: 9." (not there: it should be 22: 8.) "Deut. 22: 5." (not there: it should be 22: 3.) "Prov. 22: 20." (not in the chapter). "וֶן Chald." (false: the termination וֶן is purely Hebrew, and occurs in a multitude of nouns, e. g. בְּצִירֶוֶן, זֶקֶרֶוֶן, חֲזוֹן, etc.; again, as the author supposes it to be Chaldee, why does he refer for it to "Job 28: 22." Is *Job* written in Chaldee!)

“יָדָע.” We pass over the string of synonymes in No. 1, and proceed to “2. *he taught, punished*, Jud. 8: 16.” (the word is here in Hiph’hil, and signifies merely *to cause to know, to teach*); “3. *revealed, made known*, Gen. 45: 1.” (the word is here in the Hithp. with the reflexive meaning *he made himself known*); “4. *was discovered*, 1 Sam. 22: 6.” (the word is in Niph. the passive of the simple form Kal); “6. *he directed, pointed out*, Exod. 18: 20.” (it is here in Hiph. and with the same meaning as in No. 2.) “7. *constituted, etc.* 1 Sam. 21: 2.” (not there); “9. *regarded, etc.* 1 Sam. 2: 1. 2: 10.” (not to be found in either place); “10. *was convinced, etc.*; 11. *he produced, etc.*; 12. *distinguished,*” etc. (in all the passages referred to in support of these senses, the verb retains its primary meaning, *to know*; except in “Deut. 1: 29,” where it does not appear!); “13. *acknowledged, etc.*; 14. *feared,*” etc. (the same may be observed of the significations here given; for the last we are referred to 1 Sam. 2: 12, where it means simply *to know* scil. the Lord, as correctly rendered in the English version) “3. m. s. Pret. K. irreg. יָדָע Ps. 1: 6.” (we here find a *participle*, but no preterite) “Prov. 27: 23.” (a *future* and an *infinitive*, but no preterite) “Dan. 6: 10.” (not there: besides the whole chapter is in Chaldee!) “F. 1 Sam. 20: 30.” (we find here יָדָעָהּ which as the merest tyro might perceive, is a *preterite* and not a future) “Deut. 8: 5.” (יָדָעָהּ!) “Job 20: 20.” (יָדָע the root itself!!). “aff. הָ 3 f. s. הָ 2. m. s.” (why not also הָ 2. f. s. Jer. 50: 24. ?) “אָ 1. c. p.” (the Daghes should be erased) “אָ 2. m. p.” (a Daghes should be inserted in אָ; why have we not also אָ Gen. 31: 6. ?) “הָ her” (it should be הָ). “Niph. 1 Sam. 22: 6. F. v. 31.” (the chapter has but *twenty-three* verses). “Piail. 1 Sam. 21: 2.” (not there). “Whence אָבָר To *imagine, invent, devise, think*” (the only point of resemblance between this and the root יָדָע *to know*, that we can discover, is that both contain a ד!)

These are the results of an impartial examination of the two books whose titles stand at the head of these pages. We think we have fully redeemed our promise of showing a warrant for the opinions of their respective merits stated in the outset: viz. that the School Dictionary may be regarded as a valuable accession to the stores of Hebrew lexicography, while the Complete Hebrew and English Dictionary is wholly unworthy of

the claims which it has set up to respect and patronage. Let the reader call to mind, that in speaking of this latter performance (it is unworthy the name of a *work*), we have confined ourselves to the parts corresponding to the few examples adduced from a single letter of the alphabet in speaking of the School Dictionary, together, with the first verb, and the first word for which its author challenges our especial admiration; and he will find no difficulty in believing us when we affirm, that to enumerate all the misstatements and blunders in this volume of 700 pages, would require a book of twice its size, to say nothing of the general mode of execution, which betrays a total want of conception of the very nature of lexicography. We owe it to ourselves to state, that neither would we have spent our time or taxed the patience of the reader in wading through such a *rudis indigestaque moles* of error and absurdity, did we not feel that the interests of literature and the reputation of the country imperatively demanded it at our hands.

ARTICLE VII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1.—*An Inquiry respecting the Self-determining Power of the Will; or Contingent Volition. By Jeremiah Day, President of Yale College.* New Haven: Herrick & Noyes. 1838. pp. 200.

The question of the self-determining power of the will is intimately connected with many of the theological discussions of the present day. "Yet there are reasons for believing that it is not, in all points of view, generally and clearly understood." There is certainly great confusion of views often manifested in the prevailing popular debates and discussions embracing this question. We hail, therefore, with pleasure, the publication of this volume by President Day. We have only had time to bestow upon it a cursory examination. For this however, we feel richly rewarded, and have no hesitation in pronouncing the work every way worthy of the character of its respected author; whose habits of thinking, as well as his conciliatory spirit, peculiarly qualify him for a satisfactory and useful discussion of so difficult a subject, and concerning which there has, of late, been so much excitement among theologians of different schools.

This volume has so recently come to hand, that we have neither time nor room to give a full review of it in the present No. of the Repository. This it is our purpose to do in a future No. After a few pages of introductory observations, the running titles of the several sections of the book are the following, viz. *powers of the mind, self-determination, influence of motives, liberty and necessity, ability and inability, consciousness and accountability, common sense, mechanical and physical agency, moral government of God, activity and dependence, fatalism and pantheism, testimony of Scripture*. It is for the sake of securing a due appreciation of the last named source of evidence, on a subject so momentous, that our author has felt himself called upon to settle the several principles involved in the preceding topics of discussion. On this point his own remarks are as follows.

“Here we are met with an assumption which precludes a reference to the decision of Scripture. It is claimed, that reason and consciousness, and common sense, have already decided the point; and that God cannot contradict, in his word, what he has distinctly made known to us by the faculties which he himself has implanted in the soul. Whatever passages, therefore, which *seem* to favor a particular doctrine, may be found in the Scriptures; they are to be so interpreted, as not to signify any thing which reason pronounces to be absurd. We are called upon, then, to inquire, whether the position, that nothing but the will itself has any influence in determining what its acts shall be, *is so intuitively or demonstrably certain*, as to preclude all possibility of finding the contrary declared in the word of God. So long as this position is adhered to, it is in vain to think of appealing to the authority of the Scriptures, on the question respecting a self-determining power of the will. They will, of course, be so explained as to express a meaning in conformity with the principles assumed. This is my apology for making an application of dry metaphysics to a subject so nearly connected with one of the most important departments of scriptural theology.” (p. 13.) Again he remarks, “I do not propose to establish certain theological points, by metaphysical reasoning, and then call in the aid of revelation merely to *confirm* the results of philosophical discussion. I would only aim at removing some of the objections which may lie in the way of a ready admission of the testimony of Scripture on the subject under consideration.” (p. 14.)

Dry metaphysics, however, when applied with the caution and discrimination of Pres. Day, become attractive and entertaining, as well as instructive, to minds which are sufficiently disciplined to follow a continuous train of reasoning to its results. They are dry and uninteresting only to such as lack the patience of investigation and the power of discrimination which are necessary to conduct the mind to satisfactory conclusions on such subjects. Such only, we venture to predict, will complain of “*Day on the Will*,” as tedious

and uninformative. For though it is admitted that metaphysical reasonings are insufficient to discover to us the foundations of religious truth, without the aid of divine revelation, yet positions have been assumed claiming the support of metaphysics, from which those who maintain them can only be dislodged by the weapons of their own warfare. It is with reference to such positions, sustained by false reasoning, that our author has entered the lists as a metaphysician. His opposing positions appear to us to have been taken with great precision and accuracy, and his reasonings to be conclusive.

President Edwards, in his *Treatise on the Will*, gave a masterly exposition of the principal forms in which the doctrine of a self-determining power may be met and refuted. "But for some reason or other," as our author remarks, "his view of *contingent* self-determination appears to have attracted less attention of late, than that particular mode of statement which he resolves into an *infinite series* of volitions. The doctrine of his opponents was this, That the free acts of the will are not determined to be as they are, by any influence from *without* the will itself. This was considered by him as involving the alternative, that every volition is determined either by a preceding volition, or by *nothing at all*. The latter is contingent self-determination. This appeared to him so obviously absurd, as not to call for a logical statement, expanded into the form of a regularly constructed demonstration. To the other branch of the alternative, he has done such ample justice, that the question concerning it may be considered as definitively settled. This may be one reason why the advocates of a self-determining power in the will, adhere so tenaciously to that form of the doctrine which implies contingency, as being the only ground left, on which they can hope to maintain their position."

It is to the refutation of those who, on this ground, have evaded the conclusions of Pres. Edwards's reasoning, that Pres. Day has directed the powers of his well disciplined mind; and his success, we think, is entirely triumphant. He has demonstrated that, "if nothing from without the will of the agent can have any influence in determining what his volitions shall be, then it must be beyond the power of the Father of our spirits to give direction to the acts of the will, without interfering with the prerogative of accountable agency. Omnipotence itself cannot work contradictions. When that inexplicable power, the human will, has once been set a going, it must, according to the doctrine of some, be suffered to run on for ever, throwing off its volitions by contingent efficiency, uncontrolled and uncontrollable, by any thing from without itself."

One happy result that we anticipate from the publication of this volume is, that it will lead theological combatants to see how much of their differences arises from the use of ambiguous language. The precision of the author in his definitions of terms, and the candor and

fairness with which he treats his opponents, are examples worthy of imitation; and his discussion of the topics embraced in this volume, we think, cannot fail to exert a correcting, an enlightening, and a healing influence, wherever it shall be attentively read and candidly weighed.

2.—*The Sin against the Holy Ghost, explained agreeably to the Holy Scriptures.* By Lewis Mayer, D. D. Late Professor in the Theol. Sem. of the Germ. Ref. Church in the United States. Baltimore: Lucas & Beaver, 1838. pp. 42.

This is an Essay of uncommon merit, and furnishes interesting evidence that the learned author, having retired from his professorship in the Theol. Sem. of the Germ. Ref. Church, is still turning his biblical studies to an important practical account. A right understanding of the nature and characteristics of the sin against the Holy Ghost, is one of the most difficult and perplexing points of practical theology. It is a point, too, on which the unlearned and unstable have wrested the Scriptures more than on most others. Dr. Mayer's discussion is wholly biblical, and his views are presented with great clearness and precision. He discriminates between the sin against the Holy Ghost, described Matt. 12: 31, 32. Mark 3: 28—30. Luke 12: 10, and another unpardonable sin of which mention is made in the first epistle of John and in Heb. 6: 6 and 10: 26—29, with which the sin against the Holy Ghost has often been confounded. He dissents from those interpreters who place the commission of this sin only in defamatory words, and proves conclusively that it was not committed by the scribes and pharisees, when they reviled Jesus, saying "He hath Beëlzebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he out devils." His position is, that "*The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost was the malicious reviling of the testimony which the Holy Ghost bore to the divine mission of Jesus and the truth of Christianity, in his miraculous operations in the church, after he was come in Christ's stead.*" This sin he regards not as "a single transient act or deed of excessive enormity, but a permanent disposition of mind and manner of acting, which terminates only with the end of life; by which the person who so demeaned himself set at naught all the evidence of the truth of Christianity, even the testimony of the Holy Spirit, with all the light and comfort which accompanied it, and consequently shut himself out from faith and repentance." It is unpardonable, "because it wholly excludes all faith in Christ, and consequently all repentance and conversion to God."

This view of the subject is not new. It is substantially that of Whitby; but it is more fully sustained in this Essay, by an ample induction of Scripture proof, than we have seen it elsewhere. We rejoice, therefore, in its publication in a form in which it may be extensively read.

3.—*Discourse in Commemoration of the Glorious Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, delivered before the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of West Pennsylvania. By S. S. Schmucker, D. D. Professor of Theology in the Theol. Sem. Gettysburg, Pa. New York: Gould & Newman, 1838. pp. 131. 12mo.*

This Discourse was prepared by appointment of the synod before which it was delivered, and in compliance with a resolution of that body recommending that a discourse on the Reformation be annually delivered by each member of the synod before the people of his charge, and that one such discourse be annually delivered before the synod. It is worthy of the form in which it is now given to the public, in a neat and convenient volume, and well sustains the reputation of the author as a judicious and good writer.

After a brief statement of the "spiritual tyranny under which the whole civilized world was groaning" at the commencement of the Reformation, and "a few considerations to show that the period for this event was wisely chosen by the Head of the Church," the discourse announces and discusses the following as among the distinguishing features of the Reformation:—I. It gave us free access to the uncorrupted fountain of truth and duty, God's holy word, as our only infallible rule of faith and practice.—II. It has delivered the church from a multitude of doctrinal and practical corruptions.—III. Has given us liberty of conscience and freedom from religious persecution.—IV. Has delivered the civil government of the countries which embraced it from papal tyranny, and has given a new impulse to civil liberty, which has been felt in every kingdom of Europe."

Under the last head our author presents, and sustains by authentic documents and history, the following established principles of popery, which have led to her encroachments on civil liberty in other countries, and must also do so in our own country if she should be permitted to prevail.—"1. The popes actually do claim, at this day, jurisdiction over the highest civil governments in the world.—2. They undertake to depose civil rulers, and to absolve the people from their allegiance to their own civil governments, even if they had formally pledged that allegiance by an oath.—3. Romish ecclesiastics, priests, monks, and nuns, claim exemption from the civil jurisdiction of the governments under which they live.—4. Their priests, etc. are under such oaths to the pope and his kingdom, as render them necessarily unfaithful to the civil liberties of any country."

The positions of Dr. S. are bold and uncompromising; but they are well supported, and his argument throughout is conducted in a spirit of candor and kindness, which, unhappily, has not sufficiently characterized some recent American publications on the Catholic controversy. We are glad to see that the subject of the Reformation, and of the blessings, both civil and religious, which have resulted

from that great event, has become so prominent an object of attention in the Lutheran church. Their example is worthy the emulation of other denominations of Christians.

4.—*A New Tribute to the Memory of James Brainerd Taylor.*—
New York: John S. Taylor, 1838. pp. 440.

The subject of this tribute was one of the most interesting and useful young men who have adorned the church of Christ in any age or country. He was called to his reward in a better world in the spring of 1829, and in the spring time of his life and promise. He died at the age of twenty-eight, having, but a few months previous, completed his education as a candidate for the christian ministry, and received license to preach the gospel. But the hand of God was upon him. The malady which terminated his life, arrested him at the very commencement of his labors in the office which he had long sought with the most lively and glowing hope of usefulness to his fellow men. Yet it cannot be said of him, that he obtained the prize without running the race. During the whole progress of his preparation for the higher sphere of usefulness and duty to which he aspired, he was intent upon doing good in all the circles in which he moved. His life, though brief and principally expended in preparation for a class of labors which he was never permitted to perform, was nevertheless most usefully employed, and the memory of it remains, as a burning and a shining light, to extend and perpetuate its influences upon the cause to which it was solemnly and religiously devoted.

The "Memoir of James Brainerd Taylor" commenced by the late Dr. Rice of Virginia and completed by his brother, Rev. B. H. Rice, D. D. of Princeton, N. J., has been several years before the public, has passed through several editions and been extensively read. The design of the compilers of the *Memoir* was to exhibit his religious character and example to candidates for the christian ministry, as models for their imitation. Of its adaptation to such a design too much cannot be said in its praise. It is worthy of the estimation in which it is held, and of the extensive circulation it has acquired. The "*New Tribute*" to his memory embraces a larger design, and exhibits many "additional breathings" of the pure spirit of young Taylor, recorded by his own pen, and more minute descriptions illustrative of his character,—“and the particulars that entered into combination to form that character; together with a more graphic account of the last scenes of his brief and holy and happy life.” The author is anonymous; but his intimate acquaintance with the subject of his sketches, and the ardor with which he enters into the spirit of it, betray the kindness and affection of a brother, and give additional interest to the work. It contains also materials which were not adapted to the specific design of the "*Memoir*," and is en-

riched by extracts from an additional Number of Mr. Taylor's Diary, (which has been found,) of greater interest than any before published. We commend it to our readers, as well worthy the patronage which we trust it will receive.

- 5.—*Wanderings and Adventures in the Interior of South Africa.*
By Andrew Steedman. In two Volumes. London: 1835.
pp. 330, 358.

These volumes contain a great variety of information acquired by the author in the course of a ten years' residence at Cape Town. During that time he traversed most of the interior of Southern Africa, principally, as he informs us, "for amusement and information," and obtained an extensive collection of its productions in natural history. Among these were several new and undescribed animals. The incidents and adventures which occurred under his own observation were carefully preserved in a journal and compose the thread of his narrative, which is, at once, credible, entertaining and instructive. His accounts of the benefits resulting from the labors of the Wesleyan missionaries among the Caffres are gratifying and encouraging to the friends of missions, and the moral influence of the work, no less than the variety and value of its information, is such as to commend it to a favorable reception. Several of the scenes of the narrative are illustrated by lithographic and wood engravings, beautifully executed, and the whole is accompanied with a map of southern Africa, supplying the most recent geographical information of that country. We are happy to learn that these volumes have been recently introduced into the American market, and may be purchased of J. S. Taylor of New York, and other booksellers.

- 6.—*A Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language, containing the Accentuation, the Grammatical Inflections, the irregular words referred to their themes, the parallel terms from the other Gothic languages, the meaning of the Anglo-Saxon in English and Latin, and copious English and Latin Indexes, serving as a Dictionary of English and Anglo-Saxon, as well as of Latin and English, with a long Preface, a Map of Languages, and the essentials of the Grammar. By the Rev. J. Bosworth, D. P., B. D., F. R. S., etc. etc. London: 1837. pp. 900.*

In our Number for October, 1837, we gave a brief statement of existing efforts in England to promote the study of the Anglo-Saxon language. Among the names to which we alluded was that of Mr. Bosworth. This gentleman, now British chaplain at Rotterdam, has long been known as an indefatigable student. He published many

years ago "Elements of the Anglo-Saxon Grammar," and subsequently an Abridgement of the same. He is also the author of the "Origin of the Dutch, with a sketch of their Language and Literature," "The Origin of the Danish, and an Abstract of Scandinavian Literature," and "The Origin of the Germanic and Scandinavian Languages and Nations." The work whose title is prefixed to this notice occupied the author's attention more than seven years, four of which it was in the press. The dictionary is beautifully printed with three parallel columns on a page. With the view of illustrating the Anglo-Saxon, nearly all the radical words, and a few important compounds are followed by the parallel terms from the cognate dialects. To show more clearly the analogy of cognate languages, Mr. B. has attempted to arrange the parallel terms in the most natural order. The Low German is generally placed first, because it is now spoken by the people who occupy the territory formerly peopled by the ancestors of the Anglo-Saxons. The Dutch and Friesic words follow, because they are of the same low German branch. Then succeed the German, the Alemannic, the Francic, the Moeso-Gothic, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Icelandic, and Old Danish or Norse. The derivation immediately follows the synonymes, though on this debateable ground constant care has been taken to refrain from doing too little rather than to do too much. Then the signification is given in English, while the principal significations in Latin are added. The radical meaning is placed first, then its various significations are numbered and arranged in that order which appeared most consonant with the association of ideas; each meaning, where practicable, is confirmed by a reference to the authors who most use the word. Next follow the idiomatical expressions. By the English and Latin Indexes of about 150 pages, the Saxon of the greater part of the English and Latin terms may be found, the derivation and original meaning of most English words ascertained, and a comparison instituted with their radical cognates in the other Gothic languages. The Roman character has been employed in printing the Anglo-Saxon words with the exception of two peculiar letters answering to the English *th* in *thing* and in *thin*. As the authors are always quoted, the age and purity of a word can be seen at once. Accents are now adopted, as they were evidently used by the Anglo-Saxons, to distinguish long from short vowels. They are placed, however, only on the word and its variations standing at the head of each article. Prefixed to the dictionary is an elaborate and very learned preface of more than 200 pages. The points discussed are the connection of the Japhetic languages with the Sanscrit, the German and Scandinavian; the Anglo-Saxons; the Anglo-Saxon dialects; the ancient and modern Friesic compared with the Anglo-Saxon by the Rev. J. H. Halbertsma, a native Friesian; the Old Saxons; the Netherlands or Holland; the Goths and the Moeso-

Gothic ; the Alemanni or Suabians ; the Franks ; the High German with its various dialects ; Scandinavian literature, including a sketch of the languages of Iceland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden ; the affinity of Germanic languages ; etymology, with the manner of forming words, and an outline of the German system, and the Essentials of Anglo-Saxon Grammar with an outline of the systems of professors Rask and Grimm. The author remarks with great candor, that " the Essentials are given as the result of a long and close investigation of the language in the preparation of the Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, and a continued appeal to the grammar of a lamented friend, the late professor Rask, and to the learned *Deutsche Grammatik* of Prof. Grimm of Göttingen. It will be seen, that, as information has increased, there has been a gradual approximation, in grammatical forms and accents, to the views of Profs. Rask and Grimm."

We are truly glad in the prospect of a good Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. We have, in two or three of our large libraries, solitary copies of Hickes and of Lye,—ponderous and dusty tomes whose external form is an emblem of what reigns within. We can never hope for a revival of Anglo-Saxon studies in this country without better elementary books than we have had. The volume of Dr. Bosworth will supply the want in lexicography. A small volume published in 1834, by Mr. Benjamin Thorpe, the translator of Rask's Anglo-Saxon Grammar, will serve as an excellent Chrestomathy. It is entitled "*Analecta Anglo-Saxonica*: a selection in prose and verse from Anglo-Saxon authors of various ages ; with a Glossary, designed chiefly as a first book for students." Rask's Grammar, the *Analecta*, and the Dictionary (without the preface) may be obtained in this country for about fourteen dollars. It is no honor to us that the main root of our language remains so little explored by us. Each of our colleges should have a professor of Anglo-Saxon, or perhaps of English with special reference to its noblest source. One institution, the University of Virginia, has set a good example in establishing an Anglo-Saxon professorship. We are no *anti-Latinists* or *anti-Gallicists*, yet we long for the time when old Beowulf, and Ælfric, and Alfred shall be duly honored ; when we shall cultivate the fresh, generous, and robust speech, from whose stores Shakspeare derived his immortal words. Such studies will open to us unexpected fountains of joy and profit. We shall get a new insight into German, Dutch, Danish, Icelandic. We shall feel a warmer sympathy for all the brave nations of the north, once bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. More than all, we shall have what cannot otherwise be gained, a fundamental acquaintance with our existing vernacular tongue.

7.—*Letters from the West Indies.* Andover and New York: Gould & Newman, 1838.

We had the privilege of perusing this work in manuscript. Its author, Mr. S. Hovey, formerly a tutor in Yale College, and for a number of years subsequently professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in Williams and Amherst colleges, resided for a considerable portion of the years 1835—6—7 in the West Indies. His observations are, however, confined to the Danish island St. Croix, and to the British islands Antigua, Barbadoes, and Jamaica. His main object is, to present a general development of the condition of slavery in the West Indies before emancipation took place; a brief description of the two systems which have been adopted at different islands, viz. immediate emancipation, and what has been termed the apprenticeship system; together with the difficulties, and the degrees of success, which have severally attended them in practice. Antigua, Barbadoes, and Jamaica are among the largest islands which the English possess, and they have ever maintained a high rank in the West Indies. Two of them are seats of episcopal sees, and each has a government of its own. Antigua is one of the two which proclaimed immediate emancipation, and is a favorable place for a trial of that form of abolition. At Barbadoes, the apprenticeship system was adopted, and is generally allowed to have succeeded better than anywhere else. The same system was also adopted in Jamaica; but it has met there with the greatest opposition and discouragement; so that at Barbadoes and Jamaica we find the two extremes in the working of this plan. It is universally admitted that these three islands afford collectively a fair representation of the two systems, both in theory and practice; and that conclusions, justly drawn from these examples, may be considered of universal application in the West Indies.

The author, in our opinion, shows an unusual degree of candor, judgment, discriminating observation, and industry, in the details which he has spread out before us in these pages. The spirit in which the Letters are written is eminently kind and conciliatory. All classes of our countrymen, we presume, whatever may be their opinions of slavery in the United States, will be glad to possess themselves of the facts and views presented in the work of Professor Hovey. If slavery is ever to be abolished in this country, as it undoubtedly will be, and in some of the States at no distant day, such information as is here embodied will be of great value, exhibiting the results of one of the most important experiments ever undertaken by man.

8.—*The Works of Charles Lamb.* 2 vols. New York: Harpers, 1838.

We have read these volumes with mingled feelings of pleasure and sadness. Lamb is one of the few original characters who has

appeared in modern times. His intimate friends shrink from the task of delineating what mocks the powers of the most delicate and discriminating pencil. Beneath all his gaiety, notwithstanding all his lightness of heart, and his inveterate punning propensities, there was a tender melancholy, a longing for something higher and better, a dread of futurity, an instinctive grasp on present and surrounding objects, which invests his course with the deepest interest. After our best endeavors, we feel that we do not understand him fully; and where we do, we find it very difficult to embody our conceptions in words. Lamb was not a great poet. But as an essayist, terse, pungent, witty, ironical, full-souled, playful, and old English, we hardly know his equal. His language is after the ancient, glorious models of Thomas Browne, and Fuller and Burton.

Sorrowful is it, that such a gentle spirit should have been given to his cups, should have so degraded himself beneath the beasts which perish. The apology which Mr. Talfourd tries to set up for this habit in his friend is lame and awkward enough. We must also protest with equal decision against some of the language employed by Lamb, his correspondents, and his biographer. Profane epithets ought to be excluded from all decent books. Trifling words on the most awful subjects, no man has a right to employ. Witticisms in respect to the existence and agency of the great enemy of God and man are equally abhorrent to taste and religious feeling. What if it would spoil a good joke or a *taking* story, if Lamb's writings were divested of these obnoxious epithets? We are not to tamper with morality and religion for the sake of a pun. With all that is contained in these volumes relative to the theatre we have, of course, no sympathy. A selection of Lamb's Letters and Essays might be made to which no friend of good order would object, and which would display noble powers of thought and of description. As it is, the work is attractive, and we are not surprised at its popularity.

9.—*The Limitation of Human Responsibility.* By Francis Wayland, President of Brown University. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 1838. pp. 188.

The subjects discussed in this volume are the nature of human responsibility, individual responsibility, persecution on account of religious opinions, propagation of truth, voluntary associations, ecclesiastical associations, and the slavery question. Human responsibility is not concerned, according to Dr. Wayland, beyond the limit of our ability, nor does it require a kind of ability which has not been committed to us. Our responsibility is limited by the respect which we owe to the rights of our fellow men, and frequently by the innocent obligations which we have previously contracted. We are not

responsible for the performance of an action, when it cannot be performed without using our power for other purposes than those for which it was committed to us. Our responsibility ceases, when a particular good cannot be accomplished without the presentation of wrong motives to another; and when the performance of one duty, may be limited by the more urgent claims of another duty of the same character. The author then applies these principles to persecution on account of opinions, to the propagation of truth, to voluntary and ecclesiastical associations and to slavery. In respect to voluntary associations, he thinks that the following limitations should be observed. The *object* for which men should associate should be capable of so exact and palpable definition, that it may be always clearly distinguished from every other that might from time to time be amalgamated with it. The *mode* of operation should be accurately set forth. The *object* itself and the mode of promoting it should be entirely innocent. In the section on ecclesiastical associations, Dr. Wayland explains the principles on which christian churches are formed, particularly those of the Independents, asserts that these latter are incapable of representation, and points out some dangers into which they are liable to fall. The author remarks upon some of the aspects of slavery in the slave States, in the District of Columbia, and in Texas, and upon the duties and rights of the North and South. We have not room in this place to examine any of the opinions advanced by Dr. Wayland.

10.—*The Works of William Cowper. By Robert Southey. 15 vols. Foolscap, 8vo. London: 1835—7.*

The Works of William Cowper, edited by the Rev. T. S. Grimshawe. 12 vols. Foolscap, 8vo. London: 1835—7.

Shortly after the death of Cowper, his *Life and Correspondence* by Hayley appeared. Though extremely interesting as the work unquestionably was, yet Hayley saw fit to suppress and mutilate much of his materials. The poet's *Memoir of Himself* was brought to light in 1816. The *Private Correspondence of Cowper, with Mr. Newton and others*, was published by Cowper's relative, Dr. John Johnson, in 1824. In 1825, a small volume, with the title of "*Poems, the early Productions of W. Cowper, with Anecdotes of the Poet, collected from Letters of Lady Hesketh,*" appeared. It contained the relics which had been for many years in the possession of his cousin Theodora Cowper. Subsequently was issued Mr. Thomas Taylor's *Life of Cowper*. This, however, did not add much to the original biography.

Instead of a complete edition of the works of Cowper, which has been for a long time a desideratum, we have now two rival incomplete editions. Mr. Grimshawe, the biographer of Legh Richmond,

is a connection of Dr. John Johnson, and had the exclusive privilege of publishing unmutated the Private Correspondence edited by that gentleman. On the other hand, Dr. Southey has collected from many sources a variety of new documents and traditionary information. Dr. Southey's *Life of Cowper*, which occupies the first two volumes and nearly the whole of the third, we have just read. With many excellencies it has one striking defect. The biographer indulges in long digressions on the characters of Lloyd, Thornton, Colman, Churchill, and others, with whom Cowper had but an extremely slight connection. There are, also, other wearisome and altogether unnecessary interruptions. Such men as Colman had no communion of soul with Cowper. Then why burden his narrative with their story? The engravings, pictures of scenery, etc. which are numerous, are generally done with that skill and taste for which the London artists are so renowned. Mr. Grimshawe's edition is also enriched with superb engravings. The picture of Cowper's mother, in this edition, is almost worth the entire cost of the set. The great controversy respecting the causes of Cowper's derangement seems as far from being settled as ever. One class of biographers and critics throw their arrows at old Mr. Newton and through him at the "evangelical school;" while their opponents seek to vindicate Newton and his religion from having any thing to do with the madness in question. In our opinion religion is wholly guiltless, and Mr. Newton nearly so. Taking the evidence of some of the letters which passed between Newton and Cowper, we cannot but feel that the venerable pastor was not always judicious. His influence on the delicate sensibilities of the poet was generally soothing and salutary; but sometimes he required too much of the shrinking feelings of his companion.

In his preface to the fifteenth volume, Dr. Southey informs us that he is preparing to bring out three supplementary volumes, (which will be sold separately), to contain the memoirs and correspondence of Cowper's principal friends and relations, such as Lady Hesketh, Lady Austin, the Unwins, etc.

11.—*Academical Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities.*
By John Gorham Palfrey D. D. Professor of Biblical Literature in the University of Cambridge. Vol. I. *The four last Books of the Pentateuch.* Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1838. 8vo. pp. 511.

We have read but a small part of these Lectures. Our principal object in this notice is to mention some of the subjects discussed. The first lecture considers the antiquity and history of the Hebrew language. Some remarks are also made on grammars and lexicons and on the cognate dialects. In the second lecture the author comes to the conclusion that the several books of the Old Testament, like

those of the New, are to be judged on their several and independent grounds of evidence ; and that the mere circumstance of being excluded from the canon, and stigmatized by the title of Apocryphal, should not prevent other books from having their claims considered. The third lecture is employed on the history of the text of the O. T., the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Alexandrine version, etc. The authenticity of the books of Moses is discussed in the fourth. It is remarked, that the external evidence, though not to be so confidently urged as it has sometimes been, is in favor of the commonly received opinion, while the internal favorable evidence is of a very weighty kind and of a large amount. The purpose of the Mosaic revelation is considered in the following lecture ; various arguments, objections, and difficulties are discussed. The subject of the sixth lecture is the miracles of Moses performed in Egypt, and the exodus of the people from that country. In the seventh lecture various topics come under review. The manna and the quails are both alike considered as natural productions. The miracle consisted in the seasonable provision of such quantities of them on this occasion. The constitution of the Hebrew State, the Jewish magistracy in Egypt and in the wilderness, and the giving of the law at Sinai, are next remarked upon. In the ninth lecture we have a discussion on the Sabbath. Dr. Palfrey remarks, that the manner of its celebration was simply cessation from labor. He supposes that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution merely. In relation to the text which occurs at the beginning of Genesis, he remarks : " When we have advanced to the reading of that book, I shall be better understood when I say, that, supposing the latter half of the second verse, and the third verse, to be genuine, it is by no means clear that any institution whatever was here intended to be spoken of by the writer." The passage in *Exod.* 20: 11, " For in six days the Lord made" etc. and the parallel passage in *Deuteronomy*, are not thought by Dr. Palfrey to be genuine. " His chief reason for this persuasion is, that, supposing the genuineness of either, it presents a fragment, differing in its tone and structure from all the rest of the Decalogue, since the Decalogue, in every other case, studying the utmost brevity,* deals only in laws and their sanctions, without exhibiting the reasons on which they were founded ; a topic which seems foreign to its purpose." The tenth lecture is on the priesthood, tabernacle, and some events which occurred at Mount Sinai, subsequently to the giving of the law. The three following lectures are on *Leviticus*—the laws, customs, usages, and events recorded in that book. In the remaining seven lectures, the Mosaic history is pursued, through the books of *Numbers* and *Deuteronomy*. " One who has seen reason,"

* This does not appear to be correct in regard to the second and the fifth commandments. In the latter we have the reason of the command given in the form of a promise : " That thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

remarks the author, "to conclude that the preceding books were the work of Moses, will scarcely hesitate to refer this, [Deuteronomy] with an equal degree of confidence, to the same origin." "The former books are characterized by the comparatively dry manner of an annalist, Deuteronomy by the more full and earnest style of oral discourse." Our limits compel us to stop with this hasty glance at some of the topics handled in these Lectures. In respect to a part of the discussions, it would not be altogether fair to pronounce an opinion till the remaining volumes have appeared.

12.—*Report of Elementary Public Instruction in Europe, made to the thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Ohio, Dec. 19, 1837. By C. E. Stowe. Columbus: 1837. pp. 57.*

This Report was made in compliance with a resolve of the legislature of Ohio, requesting professor Stowe to collect, during the progress of his contemplated tour in Europe, such facts and information as he might deem useful to the State, in relation to the various systems of public instruction and education which have been adopted in the several countries through which he might pass. We are glad to see the spirit which is manifested by the legislature of Ohio in relation to this excellent Report. A large number of copies were published and distributed, and five hundred dollars given to the author for his pains. We learn that the Report has been, or is about to be, published by the legislature of Pennsylvania. As large extracts, or the entire document, have been published in many of our newspapers, it is not necessary for us, if it were practicable, to copy from it in this place. After some animated introductory observations, Prof. Stowe gives an account of elementary education in Russia. He then proceeds to full details of the Prussian system, under the heads of internal arrangements, institutions for reformation, course of instruction in the common schools, religious instruction and character of the system. Under the last head, he shows that it has great completeness, develops every faculty of the mind, is of an entirely practical character, and has a striking moral and religious bearing. In order to introduce this system into our country, as it may be done, and ought to be done substantially, teachers must be skilful and must be trained to their business; there must be institutions in which teaching is made a systematic object of attention; teachers must be competently supported and devoted to their business; the children must be made comfortable in their school; they must be punctual, and attend the whole course; they must be given up implicitly to the discipline of the school; and a beginning must be made at certain points, and the advance towards completeness must be gradual.

18.—*History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic.*
By William H. Prescott. In 3 vols. Boston : American
Stationers' Company, 1838.

Mr. Prescott is a lawyer of Boston, a graduate of Harvard, 1814, and a son, we believe, of Judge Prescott of Groton. We have heretofore seen nothing from his pen except a Memoir of Charles Brockden Brown in Mr. Sparks's Biography. The History of Ferdinand and Isabella, by the unanimous suffrage of readers of all classes, is destined to reach a very high rank in English literature. It was commenced and prosecuted under extraordinary circumstances. Soon after the author's arrangements were made, early in 1826, for obtaining the necessary materials from Madrid, he was deprived of the use of his eyes for all purposes of reading and writing, and had no prospect of again recovering it. He then made the ear do the work of the eye. With the assistance of a reader uninitiated in any language but his own, he worked his way through several venerable Castalian quartos. He then procured the services of one more competent to aid him in pursuing his historical inquiries. The process was slow and irksome to both parties, till the ear was accommodated to foreign sounds and an antiquated and barbarous phraseology. After persevering in this course for some years, his eyes, by the blessing of Providence, recovered sufficient strength to allow him to use them with tolerable freedom, in the prosecution of his labors, and in the revision of all previously written. Mr. Prescott's labors to dig up the original sources, and to explore paths where no Spaniard's foot had trod, are worthy of all praise and of all imitation. He had free access to the Ebeling and Warden collections in the Harvard College library, and the very valuable private library of Mr. George Ticknor, collected by the owner during a long residence in Spain and other parts of Europe. Mr. Rich of London, a learned antiquary, rendered Mr. Prescott much assistance. Mr. A. H. Everett, American minister in Spain, and his secretary of legation, interested themselves to procure what might have been difficult of access without such official aids. Mr. P. thus obtained some works not found in the general libraries, and many of which are not cited by any European writer, at least out of Spain. He secured, for instance, a complete collection of all the laws, ordinances, and *pragmáticas*, published during the reign of Ferdinand. In addition, a number of unpublished MSS. of that age, invaluable for illustration, and probably little known even to Castalian scholars, were procured.

Investigations so patient, industry so iron-like, and, we may add, morality so commendable and so uncommon in going to the fountain-heads, will have their reward. The labor will be appreciated throughout the civilized world. Thanks will flow in to the author from proud and jealous Europe. For us, Americans, the work will have special claims. Isabella has been justly termed *the mother of*

America. Her reign is inseparably connected with the fortunes of this new world. Those interested in the Catholic question, as many are in this country, will find in these volumes much food for contemplation. They contain the best account of the Inquisition which has appeared, derived mainly from the voluminous disclosures of Llorente.

- 14.—*Antiquitates Americanae, sive Scriptores Septentrionales Rerum Ante-Columbianarum, in America. Samling af de i Nordens Oldskrifter in deholdte efterretninger om de gamle Nordboers opdagelsereiser til America, fra det 10de til det 14de Aarhundrede. Edidit Societas Regia Antiquariorum Septentrionalium. Hafniae, 1837. 4to. pp. 479.*

This great work, a solitary copy only of which we have seen, was edited by Prof. C. C. Rafn of Copenhagen, and is brought out under the patronage of the Royal Society of Danish Antiquaries. It gives extracts from eighteen ancient authors principally Icelandic; several containing detailed accounts of the discovery, and all of them allusions to it. About one half of the volume consists of two narratives. The first may be called the History of Eric, the first settler of Greenland, and the second, which is the longer performance, is the History of Thorfinn the Hopeful, who conducted the most important expedition to Vinland or Wineland, a name given to the country discovered, from the abundance of grapes found by the adventurers. Appended to these extracts and documents, is an account of certain monuments of the ancient occupation of Greenland by the Scandinavians. There seems, on the whole, to be good reason for believing that these reports of the discoveries of the Northmen are founded on fact, and that the American continent was visited by them in the eleventh century.

- 15.—*Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature. Edited by George Ripley. Vols. I. and II., containing Philosophical Miscellanies, from the French of Cousin, Jouffroy, and Benjamin Constant. Boston: Hilliard, Gray & Co. 1838. pp. 383, 376.*

The publication, of which these two volumes form the commencement, has special reference to the three leading divisions of Philosophy, History and Theology; though its plan includes writings of a popular character, selected from the most finished specimens of elegant literature, and adapted to interest the great mass of intelligent readers. The following works will compose a part of the series: Menzel's History of German Literature; Goethe's Life, his Correspondence with Schiller, Zelter, etc., and his Conversations with Eckermann; Benjamin Constant on Religion, and on Roman Polytheism; De Wette's Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion; Select Minor Poems of Goethe and Schiller; Guizot's History of Civiliza-

tion ; Herder's Select Religious Writings ; Life of Jean Paul Richter ; Jouffroy's Moral Philosophy ; Lyric Poems from Körner, Novalis, Uhland, etc. ; Schelling on the Philosophy of Art ; Selections from Lessing, etc. The series of volumes, if it should be continued, will be composed of the contributions of different translators, entirely independent of each other. It will be devoted to the advocacy of no exclusive opinions, and is designed to include works and authors of the most opposite character, without favor or prejudice. We notice among the writers from whom it is proposed to make translations, the names of Neander, Schleiermacher, Olshausen, and Twisten.

The first two volumes of these Miscellanies contain translations from the miscellaneous, philosophical works of Victor Cousin, Theodore Jouffroy and Benjamin Constant. Introductory and explanatory notes are supplied by the translator. The extracts from Cousin are upon the destiny of modern philosophy, eclecticism, the moral law and liberty, the idea of cause and of the infinite, religion, mysticism, stoicism, classification of philosophical questions and schools. M. Cousin was born at Paris, Nov. 28, 1792. In 1810 he entered the Normal school, of which he became the principal after the revolution of 1830. In 1815, he succeeded M. Royer-Collard as professor of philosophy in the faculty of literature in the university of Paris. At the same time, he taught philosophy at the Normal school. In 1817 and 1818 he visited Germany, and, in 1820, the north of Italy. In 1822, the Normal school was suppressed. In 1824, M. Cousin, while travelling in Germany, was seized through the influence of the Jesuits and imprisoned for several months. The affair, however, terminated to his honor and to the shame of his enemies. In 1827, he was reinstated in his office in the university of Paris. From 1830 to 1835 he published four new volumes of the translation of Plato, a new edition of his own Philosophical Fragments, an edition of the posthumous works of M. Maine de Biran, and a work on the Metaphysics of Aristotle. His Reports on the state of Public Instruction in Prussia are well known in this country. His latest work, 1836, is on Public Instruction in Holland. In 1832, he was made a peer of France.

M. Jouffroy is a pupil and friend of M. Cousin. The extracts from his writings are on common sense, skepticism, history of philosophy, faculties of the human soul, method of philosophical study, eclecticism in morals, good and evil, how dogmas come to an end, the Sorbonne and the philosophers, reflections on the philosophy of history, the influence of Greece in the development of humanity, and the present state of humanity.

The passages from Benjamin Constant's writings are, on the progressive development of religious ideas, the human causes which have contributed to the establishment of Christianity, and the perfec-

tibility of the human race.. M. Constant was born of French parents at Lausanne in Switzerland, in 1767. He expired shortly after the revolution of July, 1830. He is not regarded as ranking in philosophy with Cousin and Jouffroy. All three were, however, united in opposition to the old French school of infidel philosophy, and as ardent friends to freedom of thought and of expression.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

United States.

Professor Morse's Electro-Magnetic Telegraph.

As this invention is attracting some interest in this country, and as other countries are bestowing much attention upon Electric Telegraphs constructed on somewhat similar principles, we have thought it proper, in noticing this invention, to give a few facts and dates to determine who, among all the rival claimants, is entitled to the honor of a discovery which, to use the words of a distinguished statesman, "is to make a new era in the progress of human improvements."

The suggestion of the possibility of conveying intelligence by means of electricity must have occurred many years since, to scientific and ingenious men, both in this and in foreign countries, but no practical method has been devised, until very recently, of putting this possibility to the trial of experiment. We might suppose that Franklin himself would naturally have suggested the idea, but it does not appear that he or any of the philosophers of his day thought of it. It is stated on good authority that, as early as the year 1800, the idea was suggested by an individual in this country; and Dr. Cox of Philadelphia, in 1816, in a published document, not only avowed his belief in the possibility of conveying intelligence by electricity, but hinted at some means of doing it, and predicted that new discoveries in science would probably accomplish it; yet no invention was made. In Europe, Prof. Oersted of Copenhagen, only a few years since, (we have not before us the precise date), suggested the possibility of an electric Telegraph. Ampère of Paris, and Prof. Barlow of London, about the year 1830, both proclaimed its possibility, but devised no practicable mode. In 1832, Prof. Morse of the University of the city of New York, while returning from France, unconscious, as we are told, that even the thought of sending intelligence by electricity had ever occurred to another, conceived the idea, and devised a mode of carrying it into effect. He invented a system of

signs or characters by which to read, and a mode of permanently recording by electricity. On his arrival he immediately proceeded to have parts of the apparatus made, as it is at present in operation; and but for hindrances, not connected with the invention, would have produced the apparatus complete in 1832. The distinguished Prof. Gauss of Göttingen, about two years since, (1836), invented a mode of communicating intelligence by means of an electric wire, deflecting a magnetic needle, which mode, we learn, he has now in use at Göttingen for about three miles. Prof. Wheatstone of the London University also invented a mode in 1835 or —6, using *five wires or circuits*, and has constructed a system of signs by the *deflection of magnetic needles*.

The general plan of Prof. Morse's Telegraph was first published in April 1837. The first intelligence of Prof. Wheatstone's operations reached this country in May 1837, one month after Prof. Morse's had been before the American public. Prof. Morse's plan embraced, from the beginning in 1832, but one wire or circuit. It is now successfully accomplished by him, and by it *he causes a pen permanently to write the characters of his intelligence*. He showed the efficiency of his machinery in July and August 1837, and in September following made trial of it for a distance of half a mile. Since that time his new machinery with *ten miles of wire* has been constructed and is perfectly satisfactory in its operation. Eminent scientific men in New York, Philadelphia, and Washington have witnessed its performance, approve the plan, and perceive no insurmountable obstacles to its universal application. Whatever therefore may have been previously hinted in regard to the practicability of an Electric Telegraph, it appears that Prof. Morse is the first who has devised an original Telegraph accomplishing its object perfectly. His plan was devised prior to his knowledge of the European inventions of the same name, and accomplishes its object in a totally different mode, more simple, less expensive, and more complete and permanent. It has been introduced to the consideration of Congress, and we learn, with satisfaction, that, in all probability, the means for an extensive trial of this Telegraph will be furnished. Should its success equal the expectations of most who have examined it, the results of this discovery upon society will be greater than the imagination of the most sanguine can now distinctly conceive.

Mr. O. A. Taylor's Catalogue of the Library of the Andover Theological Seminary, which we have before alluded to, Vol. IX. p. 251, is now completed. It makes a very portable and substantial octavo of 531 pages. It was commenced by Mr. Robinson, late librarian. Mr. Taylor has labored upon it for two years. It is in the alphabetical form. The name of the author is first given, and then all his productions are arranged under it, except that whole works are placed first. A short biographical notice of the author is prefixed. A foundation is laid by the use of certain characters for a systematic Index at some future time. Mr. Taylor has given not only all the

titles of books, pamphlets, etc., but all the important *articles* in the largest and most valuable works and periodical publications. The number of volumes described is not far from 12,000. Many of them are of great value. A very considerable proportion are in the Latin and German languages connected with biblical and theological studies. The library is deficient in English literature. Mr. Taylor will have the thanks of all the friends of the Seminary and of religion for his labor. It is what few persons will fully appreciate. Industry, perseverance, accurate and extensive bibliographical learning have been lavishly expended. We hope to notice the volume more fully hereafter.

The cause of science has lately met with a very severe loss in the death of Nathaniel Bowditch, LL. D., F. R. S., president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He died in Boston March 16, in the 65th year of his age. His translation of the great work of La Place on Celestial Mechanics, to which he added a commentary and many original notes of his own, has given celebrity to his name throughout the world. His practical works on navigation are of the highest value.

Mr. Marsh's Icelandic Grammar is in the press at Burlington, Vt.—The New York Review is to be hereafter united with the American Quarterly.

Great Britain.

Mr. Wilberforce's Life is in the press of Mr. Murray. It will be comprised in four Vols. 8vo., with portraits. It is edited by his sons Rev. Robert I., and Rev. Samuel Wilberforce. The Memoirs are drawn from a journal, in which, during a period of fifty years, Mr. Wilberforce was accustomed to record his private sentiments and his remarks on the incidents of the day. The work will be enriched from his correspondence with his distinguished contemporaries.

Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire with notes by Milman and Guizot is publishing in London in monthly volumes. The original, un mutilated text of Gibbon is given, along with a candid and dispassionate examination of his misstatements on the subject of religion.

Lieutenant Wellsted's Travels in Oman, the Peninsula of Mt. Sinai and along the Shores of the Red Sea are in press in two Vols. 8vo.

A Catalogue of the Irregular Greek Verbs, with all their tenses extant, their formation, meaning and usages, has been translated from Buttman's *Ausführliche Sprachlehre*, by Mr. Fishlake.

Leonard Horner, F. R. S. has translated M. Cousin's "Present State of Education in Holland, with special reference to the schools for the working classes."

The second and third volumes of Mr. Hallam's "Introduction to the History of Literature in the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries," the first volume of which was noticed in our last No., are now in press.

Dr. Carr has been consecrated bishop of Bombay, and Dr. Spencer bishop of Madras; the last as the successor of the holy and venerated bishop Corrie.

The distribution, printing, or translation of the Scriptures, in whole or in part, has been promoted by the British and Foreign Bible Society, directly in 66 languages or dialects, indirectly in 69; total 135. The number of versions, omitting those which are printed in different characters only, is 157. Of these, 105 are translations never before printed. Issues of Bibles, since the commencement of the society, 3,990,678; Testaments, 6,302,987; total, 10,293,645. Expenditure from the commencement, £ 2,291,884.

Belgium.

By recent investigations it was ascertained that the scarcity of Bibles is very great. In one village, a Bible was found, which ten or twelve persons subscribed for together, and sent one of their number into Holland to buy; and there it cost them 42 francs. During the last year, 8420 copies of the Bible were distributed in this country.

Germany.

Strauss's Life of Jesus continues to attract great attention. Its publication seems to have been the signal for an avowal of infidelity on the part of multitudes in Germany. The book has been ably examined, and its positions overthrown particularly by Neander and Tholuck.—Gesenius is now prosecuting his labors on his Thesaurus.—Hengstenberg is regarded with increasing fear by the enemies of evangelical religion. His views on church government, church and State, etc. are not of the most tolerant order.—Some of the posthumous works of William von Humboldt are looked for with much anxiety.—The concluding Nos. of Freytag's Arabic Lexicon do not yet come to hand.—The Leipzig Gazette announces that the new number of Schumacker's Astronomical Notes contains a discovery, made by Dr. Encke, professor of astronomy at Berlin, that the planet Saturn has three rings instead of two, as hitherto believed.

Polynesia.

The people of Polynesia have no names for many of the animals mentioned in the Scriptures. They had never seen horses till the missionaries introduced them. At some of the islands the people had pigs in great abundance, and they called the horse "the pig that carries the man." In the Polynesian dialects, a vowel intervenes between every two consonants. This made it impossible to *Tahitianize* the word *horse*, for not only the two consonants must have been divided, but the letter *s*, not known in the language, must have been changed or omitted. In this case, the missionaries resorted to the Greek, *hippos*, and rejecting the *s* and one *p*, made *hipo*. In reference to *baptism*, there was a native word, which signified the application of water, without determining the precise manner in which that water is applied. Lest, however, dispute should arise, they resorted, like the English translators, to the Greek, and chose a term which any native can pronounce and comprehend.

INDEX TO VOL. XI.

A.

Addison, Joseph, Works of, noticed 257.
Advancement of Biblical Knowledge 60.
Allusions to Christianity, infrequency of in Greek and Roman writers 203. The Greeks and Romans, in the time of the apostles, were not accustomed to visit Jerusalem 203. The question in reference to those writers who flourished from the time of Domitian to the end of the age of the Antonines 205. Greek writers 205. Roman writers 206. the Christians found able and In the age of the Antonines eloquent advocates 211. Writers who entered into controversy with the Christians 214. Crescens 215. Lucian 216. Celsus 220. In the age of the Antonines the Christians had obtained notoriety 221—224. Christians not unknown to men of letters 226. Eulogists of the Christians 227. The Epicureans and Cynics despised the Christians 228.
Analogies between Nature, Providence, and Grace 344. The first analogy respects the qualifications for entering into the kingdoms, humility and faith 345. Secondly, they are governed by general laws 347. The laws of each kingdom are self-executing 348. There is a striking analogy in the degree and manner of sovereignty exercised in each kingdom 349. Necessity for active exertions in each of the three kingdoms 352. The same apparent mixture of good and evil, order and confusion, light and darkness, in each 352. In each God brings good out of evil, etc. 357.
Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, noticed and commended 509.

Antiquitates Americanae noticed 519.
Antiquities of the Jews, Dr. Palfrey's Lectures on, noticed 515.
Appeal, fraternal, to the American Churches, together with a Plan for catholic Union on Apostolic principles 86.

B.

Bailey's Family Preacher, noticed 261.
Ballantine, Rev. E. Translation of Hengstenberg on the Causes of the Denial of the Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch 416.
Barrows, Prof. E. P. on the Advancement of Biblical Knowledge 60.
Bible Dictionary, Union, noticed 245.
Biblical Knowledge, the Advancement of 60.
Biesenthal's Hebrew Lexicon reviewed 452.
Bush, Prof. Exposition of the Books of Joshua and Judges by, noticed 262.

C.

Catholic Union on Apostolic Principles, Plan for, by Dr. Schmucker 86.
Christianity, infrequency of *Allusions to in Greek and Roman writers* 203.
Christian Professor, the, noticed 253.
Church, Pharcellus, Prize Essay by, on religious Dissensions 259.
Classics, Utility of the Study of to theological Students 28. An edict of the emperor Julian, advice of Augustine 29. The Reformers felt that even profane learning was from God, and to be applied to his glory 31. It materially assists in the interpretation of the Scriptures 32. Refines the taste and quickens the sense of the beautiful 33. The classics anciently called the *humanities* 34. The neglect of classical studies to be attributed, in some measure, to the manner in

which they are taught in academies and colleges 36 etc.

Connection of the Old and New Testaments, by Prof. Twesten of Berlin 232.

Court of Rome, History of, noticed 254.

Cousin, Victor, his Life and Works, noticed 519.

Cooper, new edition of his works by Southey and Grimshawe 514.

Critical Notices 245, 503.

D.

Day, Pres. on the self-determining Power of the Will 503.

Deluges, Historical and Geological, compared 1. Argument from examination of contents of caverns and fissures 1. In a cavern in Yorkshire, more than twenty species of animals made out from relics 2. The deluges of Geology and of Scripture agree in being comparatively recent 4. In being of great extent 4. The language of Scripture 5. Of commentators 6. Objections 8. Arguments against the identity of the two deluges appear to preponderate 9. Objections derived from Geology, etc. against the truth of the Mosaic history of the deluge considered 10. — viz. It is thought that certain natural processes now going on must have had an earlier date than the Noachian deluge 10. It was formerly urged that it is mathematically impossible for the present oceans of the globe to be raised so high as to cover its whole surface 11. Some parts of the globe are said to exhibit no marks of diluvial agency 12. The existence and preservation of the olive on mount Ararat have been urged as objections 13. Change of climate at the epoch of the geological deluge, etc. 13. Another objection is, that pairs of all the animals on the globe could not have been preserved in the ark 14. The present distribution of animals on the globe, etc. 16. Many species, both of animals and plants, are capable of enduring great varieties of climate 16. But the greater part of animals and plants are

confined to particular districts of the globe 17. The deluge may not have been universal 19. A new creation of animals and plants may have taken place subsequent to the deluge 19. Such a hypothesis probable 21. Could any natural causes have produced the deluge? 22. Some suppose the deluge was caused by the approximation of a comet to the earth; some, by the sinking down of continents beneath the ocean, etc. 22. Others impute it to the sudden elevation of the bottom of the ocean, etc. 23. Summary of conclusions from the preceding discussion 25.

Denial of the Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch, Causes of 416.

Design of Theological Seminaries 187.

E.

Edwards, B. B. on the Connection between the Old and New Testaments 232.

Europe, State of during the Middle Ages, by Henry Hallam, noticed 247

Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels 265.

Ewald on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew 131.

F.

Faith, Views of the Reformers on 448.

Family Preacher, the, noticed 261.

Ferdinand and Isabella, History of their Reign, by Prescott 518.

Fish, Samuel, M. D. on the Nature of Instinct 74.

Fosdick, D. Jr. on Literary Impostures 39.

Fraternal Appeal to the American Churches, together with a Plan for catholic Union, on Apostolic Principles 86.

G.

Gospels, the, Evidences of the Genuineness of, by A. Norton, Reviewed by M. Stuart 265. General remarks 265 etc. The work of Mr. Norton not superfluous 271. Positions which have been taken by leading Neologists 272 etc. The aim of Mr. Norton's book is to examine the positions 275. Agree-

ment of the respective copies of the four gospels, the present Greek text 275. Interpolations 276. Was the gospel of Matthew written in Hebrew 276. Argument against Eichhorn's positions 278 etc. Evidence respecting the authors of the gospels to be derived from the works of Justin Martyr 208 etc. Supposition that he quoted the gospel according to the Hebrew 301. Not probable 302. The testimony of Papias as recorded by Eusebius 304. Spurious epistles 304. Mr. Norton's caution commended 305. Testimony of Clement of Rome 305. Importance of the author's notes 306. Examination of Griesbach's celebrated theory respecting the Western, the Alexandrian, and the Byzantine classes of Mss. 307. The author's reasoning highly commended 308. Hug's *recensions* examined 310. The author's conclusion on the subject of Mss. 310. Commended 311. Various readings of the Greek text of the New Test. considered in relation to their character and importance 311. Less in proportion than in most of the classic authors 312. Method of detecting passages of spurious origin 315. No new doctrine discovered and no old one shaken by criticism 316. The author's effort to show that Matthew's gospel was originally written in Hebrew, and his reasons for considering Matt. I. II. etc. *supposititious*, examined 317 etc. Various readings of the gospels compared by Origen 317. Correspondencies of the first three gospels 318. Discrepancies in chronology 321, 336. The supposition that two of the evangelists copied, the one from his predecessor, and the other from both his predecessors, examined 321. Origin of the theory of a *Protevangelium* 322. Recapitulation 325. A more satisfactory method of accounting for the coincidences of the first three gospels 326. Further consideration of the same 327. The author's theory of an original Hebrew gospel examined 330. Ex-

amples of discrepancy, etc. 331. Has Justin Martyr actually quoted our canonical gospel 339. Mr. Norton supposed to reject the idea of inspiration: expressions to be regretted 340. Concluding remarks 341 etc.

Greek and Roman writers, infrequency of Allusions to Christianity in 203. *Grimshawe*, his edition of Cowper noticed 514.

H.

Hackett, Prof. H. B. Translation of Tschirner on the infrequency of Allusions to Christianity in Greek and Roman writers 203.

Hallam, Henry, Works of, noticed 247.

Head of the Church, Head over all Things 344.

Hebrew Prophets, a new Translation of, noticed 260.

Hebrew Tenses, Review of Prof. Ewald on the, by M. Stuart 131. Commendation of Prof. E. 132. Syntax of the Verb 134. Of the two modes with *Vav* relative or conversive 137. *Vav* relative with the second mode 137. *Vav* relative with the first mode 141. Participle or relative tense 143. Remarks on the preceding account of the Hebrew tenses 146 etc.

Hengstenberg, Prof. on the Causes of the Denial of the Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch 416.

Hickok, Prof. L. P. on the Design of Theological Seminaries 187.

Historical and Geological Deluges compared 1.

Hitchcock, Prof. on the Historical and Geological Deluges 1.

Holy Ghost, on the Sin against 506.

Hovey Prof., his Letters from the West Indies noticed 512.

I.

Impostures, Literary 39. What are we to understand by the expression, *literary impostures*? 39. Three classes, the first of which are *plagiarists* 41. There have been men of considerable reputation who could unblushingly advocate this species of robbery 42. Examples of its practice among the ancients 43. Modern examples: *Barbora*,

Bishop of Ugento, Richard Cumberland, Dr. Middleton, etc. 44. Rank and wealth have obtained unmerited eminence in the literary world at the expense of gifted dependents 45. A curious account by D'Israeli 46. The second class of literary impostures consists of *forgers*, 46. Forgeries connected with religion, 46. Examples since the christian era and before the dawn of letters 47. Examples in more modern times 49. D'Israeli's account of the forgeries of Joseph Vella 49. Impositions on an Englishman by a Hindoo pundit 50. Lauder's temporary imposition upon the public relating to Milton's *Paradise Lost* 51. The poems of Ossian 57. Frauds of W. H. Ireland in relation to the writings of Shakspeare 57. Playful literary impositions 58, etc.

Infrequency of allusions to Christianity in Greek and Roman writers 203.

Instinct, on the nature of, 74. Definition of, 75. Opinions of Descartes, Reid and Darwin 75. Of Cudworth, M. Buffon, M. Reimen and Cuvier 76. Of Dupont, and of Dr. Good 77. Instinctive actions seem to be performed through the intervention of the will 80, etc.

Instruction Public in Europe, Report on 517.

J.

James's Christian Professor, noticed 253.

Justification, Faith and the active obedience of Christ, Views of the early Reformers on,— Introduction 448. Bearing of these views upon the agitating controversies of the times 449. Importance of the subject 451. Views on justification 453. The term, *justification*, not of recent coinage 453. The terms, *pardon*, *forgiveness*, and *justification* employed as synonymes 454. Views of Augustine 454. Of Oecumenius, Bernard and of John Calvin 455. Of Ursinus 459. Of Paraeus 463. Imputation of the righteousness of Christ and remission of sins customarily joined in justification 465. Melancthon says

that justification signifies forgiveness of sins 466. The French and Augsburg Confessions unite substantially in the same sentiment 467. Also the Saxony and Belgic catechisms 468. Wendeline remarks that they express the whole nature of justification who affirm that it consists in the forgiveness of sins 469. Dr. Tilenus says that either forgiveness or imputation taken separately expresses the whole nature of justification 470. Similar statement of Piscator 472. The Calvinistic church, at the first, almost entirely took the ground that pardon was the whole of justification 473. The Calvinists gradually began to make a distinction 474. Opinions of Dr. Amandus Polanus 474. Dr. F. Gomar 476. He explains forgiveness of sins as the prior member of justification 477. A modern definition of pardon the same which the later Reformers gave of justification 478. Recent instances of departure from primitive Calvinism 479, such as that Adam was not created righteous 479. The same the opinion of Dr. Taylor of Norwich 480. Osiander condemned for maintaining this opinion 481.

K.

Knowledge, Biblical, the advancement of 60. What does a thorough knowledge of Scripture involve? A thorough acquaintance with the original languages of Scripture;—an acquaintance with the geography and antiquities of ancient Palestine, etc. 61. An enlarged acquaintance with ancient history 62. With the internal history of the ancient world, its moral, religious and political condition 63. With the laws of human language 64. The constitution of man considered as an intellectual and moral being 65. A right state of heart 65. How may a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures be most effectually diffused? We must have some men in the church who shall press every department of bib-

lical and theological learning to its utmost limits, 66. The great body of the christian ministry must receive such an education as shall enable them to avail themselves of the results of the investigations of others 69. The original languages of Scripture, the Latin language 70. Theological Seminaries, 71., etc.

L.

Lamb Charles, his works noticed 512.

Landis, Rev. R. W. on the views of the Reformers on justification, faith and the active obedience of Christ 448.

Letters from the West Indies, noticed, 512.

Lexicography, Hebrew 482. Review of Biesenthal's and Roy's Hebrew Dictionaries 482. Great recent improvements in the department of philology 482. Qualifications of a lexicographer 483. Changes in the usages of languages 484. Necessity of a knowledge of the cognate dialects of a language 485. The lexicographer must discover the primary meaning of a word and trace a connection between it and its numerous secondary significations 487. Use of comparative philology 487. Summary of the lexicographer's duties 487. Great learning and useful labors of Gesenius 488. Comparisons between the Hebrew and the Indo-European tongues 489. Biesenthal's Dictionary exhibits great accuracy, a familiarity with biblical and rabbinical literature, and an inquiring and philosophical turn of mind in the author 490. Roy's Dictionary undertaken on no settled principles, extremely careless in its execution, and betrays an almost total ignorance of the first principles of Hebrew grammar 490. Merits of Biesenthal's work proved by examples 491. Connection between מְלִיץ and מְלִיץ 492. Singular error of Roy 492. Definition of מְלִיץ by the two writers 493. Reuniting of מְלִיץ and מְלִיץ 495. Mistakes of Roy on these words 496. מְלִיץ and מְלִיץ 497. Bie-

senthal might have carried out more fully his idea of reuniting roots 498. Roy has not accomplished his plan of copying each form of every Hebrew word that occurs in the Bible 499. The plan an absurd one 500. The author not familiar with the letters of the cognate dialects 500. Errors on the word מְלִיץ 501. On the word מְלִיץ 502. General opinion of its contents 503.

Libraries, public 174. The great want in this country of ample libraries 174. Arguments for efforts to found them 175. The whole population personally and vitally interested 176. The interests of Christianity require it 177. The condition and prospects of our large commercial cities both demand and favor such an effort 177. The several departments of art, science and literature require \$ 800,000 to place them on a respectable footing in a library of reference 179. Number of volumes in the principal public libraries in the United States 180. Libraries of Colleges 180. Of Theological Seminaries 182. Other public libraries 182. The principal libraries of Europe 183. The libraries of the United States compared with those of Europe 185. Appeal to American citizens 185.

Literary Impostures 39.

Literature of Europe, in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, by Henry Hallam, noticed 247.

M.

Mayer, Dr. on the Sin against the Holy Ghost, noticed 506.

Middle Ages, Condition of Europe during the, noticed 247.

Missionaries, a new order of, noticed 262.

Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, causes of the denial of, 416.

Mother's Request, the, noticed 261.

N.

Nature of Instinct, the, 74.

New Tribute to James B. Taylor noticed 508.

Nordheimer, Professor, Critical Gram-

mar of the Hebrew language, by, noticed 262.

Nordheimer's Review of Biesenthal's and Roy's Hebrew Lexicon 452.

Norton, Andrews, Evidences of the genuineness of the gospels, by, Reviewed by M. Stuart 265.

Noyes, George R., A new translation of the Hebrew Prophets, by, noticed 260.

O.

Obedience of Christ, the active, Views of the Reformers on, 448.

Old and New Testaments, Connection of, 232. Introductory remarks 232. The name, Holy Scriptures, defined 233. How far the Old Testament can be regarded as the rule of faith and life for Christians 235. It contains divine revelations and precepts 235. How far these are of authority 236. The New Testament not in opposition to the Old 237. The Old Testament in contrast with the New 240. An over estimate of the Old Testament by the older theologians 242. The religion of the Old Testament not identical with that of the New 243.

P.

Packard, J. On the utility of the study of the classics to Theological students 28.

Pulfrey, J. G. His Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities 515

Patton, Prof. R. B. on Public Libraries 174.

Pentateuch, Causes of the denial of the Mosaic origin of the 416. Introductory notice 416. Shallow and skeptical interpretation 418. Calvin and his successors 420. Spencer 421. Clericus 425. J. D. Michaelis 430. Eichhorn's Critique upon Michaelis 431. Historical skepticism 435. Reverence for history began to disappear in the seventeenth century 426, — insufficient to account for the change of opinion in respect to the Pentateuch 437. Other causes 439. Judgment of late historians 440, — differs from that of theologians 440. Heeren's position 441. Johannes V. Müller 442. Luden 443. Wachler 444.

Schlosser and Leo 445. Von Rotteck 446. Ideler, a distinguished chronologist 447.

Persia, Information from, 263.

Peters, Anzonetta R. Memoir of, noticed 259.

Plan for Catholic Union on Apostolic principles 86.

Political Economy, Elements of, noticed 257.

Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella, noticed 518.

Prophecies, Principles of interpreting the, noticed 257.

Public Libraries 174.

R.

Reformation, Schmucker's Discourse on, commended 507.

Reformers, Views of, on the doctrine of justification, faith and the active obedience of Christ 448.

Religious Dissensions, their cause and cure, noticed 259.

Responsibility, Limitation of 513.

Ripley, Geo. his Specimens of Foreign Literature noticed 519.

Rome, Outline of a history of the Court of, noticed 254.

Roy's Hebrew Lexicon, reviewed 482.

S.

Saxon-Anglo, Bosworth's Dictionary of, noticed 509.

Schmucker, S. S., D. D., Fraternal appeal of, to the American churches, together with a plan for Catholic union on Apostolic principles 86.

Schmucker, Dr. his Discourse on the Reformation, noticed 507.

South Africa, Wanderings in, noticed 509.

Southey, his edition of Cowper noticed 514.

Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature 519.

Steedman, A. his Adventures and Wanderings in South Africa, noticed 509.

Stowe, C. E. His Report on Public Instruction in Europe 517.

Stuart, M. on the Hebrew Tenses 131.

Stuart, M. Review of Norton on the Genuineness of the Gospels 266.

Study of the classics, Utility of, to theological students 28.

T.

Taylor, J. B. New Tribute to his Memory noticed 508.

Testaments, Old and New, the Connection of 232.

Theological Seminaries, Design of 187.

To furnish the most efficient ministry for the world 188. They must labor to extend and perfect theological science 188. To secure a thorough and specific mental discipline 191. And to cultivate a spirit of warm devotional piety 193. They must be allowed the free investigation of the Bible 193. Must not foster a sectarian spirit 195. Must not interfere in ecclesiastical government 197. Must stand responsible to the enlightened sentiment of the christian church 198. Ecclesiastical bodies must not grant licenses but at the completion of a full course of study 199. The number of theological seminaries may safely be left to the result of fair competition 200. They must be the subjects of the unceasing prayers of the church 201.

Tackirner, H. T. on the infrequency of the allusions to Christianity in Greek and Roman writers 203.

Twosten, Prof. of Berlin, on the Connection of the Old and New Testaments 212.

Tyler, W. S. on the Analogies between Nature, Providence, and Grace.

U.

Union Bible Dictionary, noticed 245.

Union, Catholic, on Apostolic principles, plan for, and Fraternal Appeal, by Dr. Schmucker, 86. A few principles premised 89. The duty of Christians to endeavor to heal divisions and promote unity among all whom they profess to regard as disciples of Christ 90;—urged by scriptural injunctions 90. Testimony of Paul against the spirit of sectarianism 91. Import of the word *aipeous* (heresy) 93. *Example of the Apostles and of the Apostolic and subsequent age* 95. Differences of opinion and practice respecting the observance of the sabbath, etc. 96. All acknowledged Christians resid-

ing in the same place belonged to the same church 98. *Baneful effects of sectarian divisions* 99. They destroy community of interest, etc. 99;—impede the impartial study of the Scriptures 101;—retard the spiritual conquests of Christianity 102;—are unfriendly to the spread of the gospel in heathen lands 103. *The nature of the union of the primitive church* 106. It did not consist in any compact ecclesiastical organization of the entire church in a nation under one supreme judicatory 106. The first synod or council after the apostolic age 108. It did not consist in the organization of the whole church under one visible head, etc. 110. The papal hierarchy 111. The unity of the primitive church did not consist in absolute unanimity in religious sentiments 113. The Scriptures contain no provision to preserve absolute unity of sentiment 113. Differences of opinion did exist among the primitive Christians 115. The first means of union was entire unity of name, 118. The second, unity of opinion on all fundamental doctrines 120. The Apostle's creed 121. The Nicene creed 123. The third bond of union was the mutual acknowledgement of each other's acts of discipline 125. The fourth was sacramental and ministerial communion, 126; the fifth, occasional epistolary communication 128; and the last was occasional consultation in councils or synods 130.

The same subject continued 363.

Dates of the successive formation of the several protestant churches 364. The Lutheran church 364; the German Reformed, the Episcopal, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, etc. 365. *Causes of sectarian strife* 366. Absence of any visible bond of union, etc. 367. Separate organization on the ground of doctrinal diversity 367. The use of *trans-fundamental* creeds 368. Testimony of Origen 369. Sectarian training of the rising generation 371. Sectarian idolatry or man-worship

372. Exclusive cultivation of sectarian literature 374. Ecclesiastical pride 374. Conflict of pecuniary interests 375. The primitive church free from this 375. Apostolic canons 376. Opinion of Neander 377. *Remedy of existing evils* 379. Universal conformity not required, 380. Denominations not required to renounce their respective standards 381. *Plan of Union, first feature* 382. *Second feature* 383. *Third feature* 393. Creed to consist of two parts 393. Advantages of such a creed, 394—to keep heretics out of the church 394—to give prominence to acknowledged truths 395. *Fourth feature*, free sacramental, ecclesiastical and ministerial communion 400. *Fifth feature*, co-operation, as far as practicable, regardless of sect 403. *Sixth feature*, the Bible the text-book of instruction 405. *Seventh feature*, missionaries should profess and use the

common creed 406. Churches should adopt geographical names 407. *The Apostolic Protestant Confession* 408. Apostles' creed—the United Protestant confession 409. Mode of operation 414. *Utility of the study of the classics to Theological Students* 28.

V.

Views of the early Reformers on the doctrine of Justification, Faith and the active obedience of Christ 448.

W.

Wayland, Francis, D. D., Elements of Political Economy by, noticed 257. — *on the Limitation of Human Responsibility* 513. *West Indies, Letters from*, noticed 512. *Will, Pres. Day on* 503.

Y.

Young Disciple, noticed 259.

ERRATUM. On p. 343, line 6 from the top, read *miracle* instead of *fable*.

THE
A M E R I C A N
B I B L I C A L R E P O S I T O R Y .

CONDUCTED
BY ABSALOM PETERS, D. D.

VOLUME TWELFTH—NUMBERS XXXI, XXXII.

NEW YORK:
GOULD AND NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS AND PRINTERS.
BOSTON:
PERKINS & MARVIN, AND CROCKER & BREWSTER.
1838.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XII.

NO. XXXI.

	Page.		Page.
ART. I. GEOLOGY AND REVELATION. By Rev. Dr. Pond, . . .	1	4. Examination of Objections, . . .	170
ART. II. THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH, HEAD OVER ALL THINGS; ILLUSTRATED BY ANALOGIES BETWEEN NATURE, PROVIDENCE, AND GRACE. By Prof. Tyler. [Concluded from Vol. XI. p. 363.] . . .	22	5. Was not the Gospel according to the Hebrews itself a TRANSLATION from the Greek Original of Matthew, with interpolations and alterations? . . .	174
ART. III. THE THEOLOGY OF SOCRATES, FROM XENOPHON'S MEMORABILIA. Transl. from the Latin, by F. M. Hubbard, . . .	47	6. Conclusion, . . .	177
§ I. An Outline of the state of Theology among the Greeks before Socrates, . . .	48	ART. VIII. WHAT WERE THE VIEWS ENTERTAINED BY THE EARLY REFORMERS, ON THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION, FAITH, AND THE ACTIVE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST. By Rev. R. W. Landis, Jeffersonville, Pa. [Continued from Vol. XI. p. 481.] . . .	179
§ II. Socrates and his Theology, . . .	52	§ II. Views entertained by the Reformers on the subject of Faith, . . .	179
ART. IV. THE WEAPONS OF UNIVERSALISM REVERSED. By Rev. Edwin Holt, . . .	70	ART. IX. THE PHILOSOPHY OF ECCLESIASTES. Transl. from the German MS. of Dr. Nordheimer, by Wm. W. Turner, . . .	197
ART. V. MISSIONARY SCHOOLS. By Rev. Dr. Anderson, . . .	87	ART. X. STATE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. By the Editor, . . .	219
ART. VI. REASONS FOR THE STUDY OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE. By Prof. Edwards, . . .	113	ART. XI. CRITICAL NOTICES, . . .	238
ART. VII. INQUIRY RESPECTING THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL, AND THE GENUINENESS OF THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF THE SAME; WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO MR. NORTON'S VIEW OF THESE SUBJECTS AS EXHIBITED IN HIS TREATISE ON THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS. By M. Stuart, . . .	133	1. Prichard's Physical History of Mankind, . . .	238
1. Introductory Remarks. . .	133	2. Ticknor's Med. Philosophy, . . .	239
2. Testimony of the Christian Fathers, . . .	135	3. Bush's Commentary on Genesis, . . .	241
3. Other circumstances which render the existence of an early genuine Hebrew Matthew improbable, . . .	163	4. Cudworth's Intellect. System of the Universe, etc. . .	242
		5. Wiseman's Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, . . .	243
		6. Life and Discourses of Rev. S. H. Stearns, . . .	245
		7. Nordheimer's Heb. Grammar, . . .	247
		8. Philip's Life and Times of Whitefield . . .	248

CONTENTS OF VOL. XII.

<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">9. Memoir of Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right; vertical-align: bottom;">Page. 249</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10. Parker's Journal of an Exploring Tour beyond the Rocky Mountains</td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: bottom;">250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11. Home Education</td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: bottom;">251</td> </tr> </table>	9. Memoir of Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy	Page. 249	10. Parker's Journal of an Exploring Tour beyond the Rocky Mountains	250	11. Home Education	251	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">12. Dillaway's Cicero De Oratore</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right; vertical-align: bottom;">Page. 252</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13. Memoir of Mrs. Taylor</td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: bottom;">253</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">ART. XII. LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE,</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: bottom;">253</td> </tr> </table>	12. Dillaway's Cicero De Oratore	Page. 252	13. Memoir of Mrs. Taylor	253	ART. XII. LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE,			253
9. Memoir of Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy	Page. 249														
10. Parker's Journal of an Exploring Tour beyond the Rocky Mountains	250														
11. Home Education	251														
12. Dillaway's Cicero De Oratore	Page. 252														
13. Memoir of Mrs. Taylor	253														
ART. XII. LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE,															
	253														

NO. XXXII.

<p>ART. I. REMARKS ON VOLUNTARY AND ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF BENEVOLENT OBJECTS. By Rev. Dr. Woods, 257</p> <p>ART. II. AUTHORITY, A SOURCE OF MORAL OBLIGATION. By Prof. Hickok, 276</p> <p>ART. III. THE VERSION OF ULPHILAS AND THE MOESOGOTHIC LANGUAGE. By W. W. Greenough, 297</p> <p>ART. IV. INQUIRY RESPECTING THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL, AND THE GENUINENESS OF THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF THE SAME; WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO MR. NORTON'S VIEW OF THESE SUBJECTS AS EXHIBITED IN HIS TREATISE ON THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS. By Prof. Stuart, . . . 315</p> <p>7. Introductory Remarks 315</p> <p>8. Positive Evidence establishing the Genuineness of Matthew I. II. 317</p> <p>9. Examination of Objections, 330</p> <p>ART. V. THE SCRIPTURAL IDEA OF ANGELS. By Rev. Dr. Mayer, 356</p> <p>ART. VI. REVIEW OF MISS MARTINEAU'S WORKS, 389</p> <p>ART. VII. WHAT WERE THE VIEWS ENTERTAINED BY THE EARLY REFORMERS ON THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION, FAITH, AND THE ACTIVE OBE-</p>	<p>DIENCE OF CHRIST? By Rev. R. W. Landis, 420</p> <p>§ III. Views of the Reformers on the Obedience of Christ, 420</p> <p>Conclusion, 452</p> <p>ART. VIII. CAUSES OF THE DENIAL OF THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH. Translated from the German of Prof. Hengstenberg of Berlin. By Rev. E. Ballantine. [Concluded from Vol. XI. p. 448.] 458</p> <p>Naturalism, 458</p> <p>ART. IX. CRITICAL NOTICES, 492</p> <p>1. Gesenius on the Phoenician Language, 492</p> <p>2. Rome in the Third Century, 494</p> <p>3. London Statistical Journal, 495</p> <p>4. Schaffler's Last Days of Christ, 496</p> <p>5. State of Religion in France, 497</p> <p>6. Report of the Morrison Education Society, 498</p> <p>7. Evangelical Society of Geneva, 498</p> <p>8. Bacon's Discourse on the Traffic in Spirituous Liquors, 499</p> <p>9. Coit's and Townsend's Arrangement of the Bible, 501</p> <p>10. Guizot's History of Civilization in Europe, 503</p> <p>11. Letters on Theron and Aspasio, 504</p> <p>12. Topical Arrangement of the Holy Scriptures, 506</p> <p>13. Spring's Fragments, 507</p> <p>14. Fosdick's Germ. Grammar, 508</p> <p>ART. X. LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE, 508</p>
--	---

THE
AMERICAN
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

NO. XXXI.

JULY, 1838.

ARTICLE I.

GEOLOGY AND REVELATION.

By the Rev. Enoch Pond, D. D. Prof. of Theology in the Theol. Sem. Bangor, Me.

“Thy word,” saith the devout Psalmist, *“is true from the beginning, and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever.”* Other systems of doctrine and philosophy have had their day. They have risen into notice; have gathered around them abettors and followers; have flourished for a time, and then passed into silence and forgetfulness. But not so the system of Divine revelation. This has stood the test of time, and *will* stand when time shall be no more. It has gathered strength from the assaults of enemies, and from all the forms of trial to which it has been subjected, and is as unchangeable and enduring as the throne of heaven. *“The grass withereth, and the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand forever.”* *“Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven.”*

Infidels have long hoped and predicted, that the investigations of science would invalidate the claims of Divine revelation. In this expectation, they have turned from one science to another, and have eagerly caught at any fact or appearance which could be tortured into a seeming accordance with their views. As might be expected, they have had their eye upon the researches of the geologist. They have anxiously followed him from steep to cavern, from mountain height to the deepest

explored recesses of the earth, in confident expectation that *something* would be discovered which might be regarded as contradictory to revealed truth.

Geological investigations have not, indeed, been brought to a termination ; nor is it likely that they will be for a great while yet to come. Still, enough has been discovered to entitle geology to be regarded as a *science*, and to lead to some very important general conclusions. My present object is to compare these conclusions—those of them which may be considered as established—with the teachings of the Bible ; and to show, in the first place, that there is *no discrepancy* between the two ; but secondly, that in many points, the former *go to illustrate and support the latter*.

The single point, in which there is so much as the appearance of discrepancy between the deductions of geology and the statements of Scripture, respects *the age of this world*, or the *date of its creation*. It is assumed by the objector, that the Scriptures make the age of the world to be something less than six thousand years—that immediately previous to the creation of our first parents, the world itself was created out of nothing. On the other hand, it has been demonstrated by geologists, that the world has existed much more than six thousand years ; that its existence dates back to a vastly remote period ; that the placing of man upon it is comparatively a recent event in its history. I need not go into the detail of proof on which this geological conclusion is based. To my own mind it is perfectly satisfactory. I would as soon think of disputing the Copernican system of astronomy, or the results of modern chemistry as to the elementary constituents of what used themselves to be considered elements, as to call in question the deductions of geology respecting the great antiquity of the world. There is no accounting for numberless facts which meet us, as we penetrate into the bowels of the earth, or walk upon its surface, but by supposing the earth itself to have existed for a very long period—a period remotely anterior to the origin of our race.

Here then, it is said, is a manifest contradiction between the deductions of geology, and the declarations of Scripture. The teachings of the Bible are contradicted by plain matters of fact, and of course cannot be received as true.

But let us look at this subject again. Let us be sure that we understand some of the first verses in the Bible, before we

declare them inconsistent with facts, and abandon the entire volume of inspiration as an imposture.

In attempting to explain the first chapter of Genesis, I shall not take the ground that this is mere human tradition, and no part of the revelation which God has given us. It is an *unquestionable* part of Divine revelation. We have as much reason to think this portion of Scripture inspired, as that inspiration may be predicated of any other part of the Bible.

Nor shall I take the ground that this chapter, and several which follow it, are a poetical *mythus*, a *fable*, designed to convey moral instruction under a seeming narration of facts. For the truth is, these chapters are not poetry, but simple prose. They are not a parable, but a plain narration of important *facts*;—facts, the truth of which is assumed in the subsequent parts of Scripture, and on the ground of which the most important doctrines are based.

Nor shall I take the ground that the term *day*, so frequently recurring in the first chapter of Genesis, signifies an *epoch*—an indefinitely long period of time. I think it signifies a *literal day*, including the evening and the morning—a period of twenty-four hours. This is the proper philological interpretation of the word, as here used; and we have no occasion, and as it seems to me no right, to lay it aside, for any less apposite and less usual sense.*

I have said, that those who represent geology as inconsistent with Scripture, *assume* that the Scriptures make the entire age of the world to be something less than six thousand years. But have they any right to this assumption? Where is it said in Scripture that the world we inhabit was made out of nothing near the time of the creation of our first parents? *Nowhere*. “IN THE BEGINNING, God created the heavens and the earth.” This is an independent, a most important, and I will add (considering the circumstances under which it

* I know that the original word here employed, like our English word *day* by which it is translated, is used with considerable latitude in the Scriptures, and elsewhere; so that the particular sense in which it is used, must be learned from the connection. And in the first chapter of Genesis, the connection, as it seems to me, determines that the word stands for a *literal day*. Each day consists of an *evening* and a *morning*. Besides, on the seventh day *the Sabbath* was instituted, which has never been understood to include more than a *literal day*.

was uttered) a most wonderful proposition,—announcing that, at some time—at some remote period of antiquity—God did *create*, did bring into existence, the heavens and the earth. At what time, in the lapse of eternal ages, this great event took place, we are not informed. What was the appearance or consistence of the earth, at its first creation, we are not informed. What changes it underwent—what forms of animal or vegetable life it bore upon its surface—what upheavings and revolutions passed over it, during the remoter periods of its history, we are not informed. The geologist has space enough here, for his deepest, his widest researches. He has scope enough for any conclusions which he may be led to adopt, without the remotest danger of trenching on any of the annunciations of revealed truth.

That a very long period—how long no being but God can tell—intervened between the creation of the world, and the commencement of the six days' work recorded in the following verses of the first chapter of Genesis, there can be, I think, no reasonable doubt. It was during this period, that the earth assumed a solid form. Its heated masses began to cool and conglomerate. The primary rocks were chrystalized. The transition, the secondary, and the deeper portion of the tertiary rocks were deposited and petrified. The lower forms of animal and vegetable life appeared. Vast multitudes of marine and amphibious animals—some of them of huge and terrific forms—lived, and died, and their remains became imbedded in the solid rocks. Vast quantities of vegetable matter also accumulated on the earth, and was treasured up in its deep foundations, in the form of coal, for the future use and benefit of man.

It is evident that the earth, during this period, underwent frequent and terrible revolutions. Its internal fires were raging in their prison-house, and often bursting through the crust which confined them. The mountains were upheaved from their deeper than ocean beds; trap dykes were formed; and the stratified rocks were tilted from their horizontal positions in every direction.

It was subsequent to one of these terrible revolutions, which had torn the earth from its very centre, merged the greater part of it beneath the ocean, and destroyed nearly every trace of animal and vegetable existence, that we have mention made of it, in the second verse of our Bible. It was then *תהו ובהו* *confused* and *desolate*, and darkness was upon the face of the

vast abyss. The earth was dark at this period, not because there was no sun, but because caliginous gases and vapors had utterly obscured the light of the sun, and shut it out from the desolate world.

But God had not abandoned the work of his own hands. He had nobler purposes to answer by this seemingly ruined world, than any which had yet been manifested. It was no longer to be the abode only of saurians and mastodons, and other huge and terrific monsters, but was to be fitted up and adorned for a new and nobler race of beings. Accordingly the Spirit of God began to move upon the troubled waters, and order and harmony were gradually restored.

At length "God said, let there be light, and there was light." The dense clouds and vapors which had enveloped the earth, and shut out entirely the light of heaven, were dissipated, so that it was easy to distinguish between night and day. "And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night; and the evening and the morning were the first day."

"And God said, let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament, from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so. And God called the firmament heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day." The work here denoted was the elevation of the clouds, and the separation of the aërial waters, by the visible firmament—the seeming expanse of heaven—from those which rested on the surface of the earth.

"And God said, let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so. And God called the dry land earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he seas. And God saw that it was good. And God said, let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself; and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the third day." In the course of this day, vast portions of the earth's surface were elevated, and other portions were de-

pressed. Continents were raised, and the oceans were made to know their bounds. As soon as the dry land appeared, it began to be clothed with vegetation. The forming hand of the Creator covered it, in many instances, with new species of trees and vegetables, in place of such as had been finally destroyed.

“And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven, to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and for years. And let them be for lights in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth; and it was so. And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night. He made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day, and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness. And God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the fourth day.” The language here used does not import, that the sun, moon and stars were now first *created*,* but only that they were first *made to shine out* upon the renovated earth. They now became *visible lights* to the earth. The clouds had before been so far dissipated, that it was easy to distinguish between day and night; but now they were entirely dispersed, and the lights of heaven shone down upon the earth “in full orb’d splendor.”

In all this chapter, as God is speaking to man, so he speaks after the manner of men, and represents the progression of things, not with philosophical precision, but as they would have *appeared* to a human spectator. For instance, when it is said that God made a firmament, we are not to understand that the seeming canopy above us is a literal *thing* or *substance*, called a firmament, but only that such is the *appearance* to a spectator on the earth. And when it is said that God made two great lights, and set them in the firmament, we are not to suppose that the sun and moon were now first created, and fixed in the

* The original word here translated *made* (v. 16) is not the same as that used in the first verse, which properly signifies *to create*. When it is said that “God *made* two great lights,” the meaning is that he *made them to become lights to the earth*. The same word is used in the fourth commandment, where it is said that “in six days the Lord *made* heaven; and earth, and sea, and all that in them is.” During the six days, God *renewed* the face of the desolate earth, and *made* the heavens visible, and gave the seas their bounds, and filled earth, and air, and ocean with their appropriate inhabitants.

blue expanse, but that such would have been the *appearance* to man, had he been in existence on the fourth day, when the clouds and vapors were dispersed, and the sun and moon commenced their shining.

On the fifth day, God peopled the waters with fishes, and the air with birds and flying fowls.

On the sixth day, he brought forth "the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good." In the course of this day, God created man also, in his own image. "Male and female created he them. And God blessed them," and gave them dominion over all the creatures that he had made.

"On the seventh day, God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Here we have the institution of the Sabbath—that statedly recurring season of holy rest, which commenced with the renovation of the world, and is to continue to the end of it.

It appears, therefore, that in the six days' work which has been considered, we have an account, not of the original *creation* of the world—this had been created long before—but of its *renovation*;—of its being *remodeled* and *refitted*, after one of those terrible revolutions by which it had been desolated, and its being prepared for the residence of innocent and happy man.*

If any are disposed here to inquire,—on supposition the earth existed for a long period after its creation, before it was fitted up for the use of man—why we have no particular account of this period in the Scriptures; it would be enough to answer that *we do not know*. Obviously, however, it was no

* It is remarkable that some of the Christian Fathers entertained similar views respecting the creation of the world, to those which have been here expressed. Justin Martyr, and after him Gregory Nazianzen "suppose an indefinite period to have elapsed between the creation, and the first ordering of all things." Basil and Origen "account for the creation of light prior to the fourth day, not by supposing that there was no sun, but that the rays of the sun were prevented by a dense chaotic atmosphere, from penetrating to the earth." —See *Wiseman's Lectures*, p. 178.

part of the object of the Divine Author of Scripture to gratify the mere *curiosity* of man. Why have we no particular account of the life of our Saviour, between the period of his childhood, and that of his public ministry? Why does the writer of the Acts of the Apostles leave Paul in his own hired house at Rome, and not follow him through, to the end of his eventful history? It was enough for the inspired writer to make us acquainted with the original creation of the world, and of its being prepared for the use of man. This is all in which we have a direct personal interest. To have proceeded further in the narrative would have been to enter a field of scientific inquiry and curiosity from which the pen of inspiration is uniformly and wisely kept aloof.

In view of what has been said, it is evident, to my own mind, that there is *no discrepancy* certainly between the teachings of geology and those of the Bible respecting the date of the world's creation. Geology assures us that this earth must have existed for a very long period—one remotely anterior to the creation of man; and we find nothing in the first chapter of Genesis, or in any other part of Scripture, which is at all inconsistent with such a supposition.*

But it is not enough to say that the teachings of geology, and those of the Bible, are *not self-contradictory*. In various particulars, as I shall now proceed to show, the former serve to illustrate and support the latter.

1. Geology teaches that this world had a *beginning*. To be sure, it places its origin at a very remote period. Still there *was* an origin—there was a *beginning*. The organizations on the earth, and in the earth itself, have uniformly taken place in an ascending series, from the less to the more perfect. Trace now this series backward, and we at length arrive at a period when there were *no* organizations, and when the earth itself *was not*. The geological conclusion therefore is, that the earth was originally *created from nothing*. The same also is a doctrine of the Bible. “In the beginning, God *created* the heavens and the earth.” “Before the mountains were brought forth, *or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world*, even from

* When this article was written, the author had not seen Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise on Geology and Mineralogy. He has since been gratified to learn that his own views of the first chapter of Genesis agree, to a shade, with those of that celebrated philosopher and Christian.

everlasting to everlasting thou art God." Ps. 90: 2. "I was set up from everlasting, *or ever the earth was.*" Prov. 8: 23.

The geological conclusion that this world must have had a beginning is of very great importance in connection with natural theology. The most plausible of all the atheistical hypotheses are those which assert *the eternity of the world*. Without undervaluing anything which has been written with a view to refute these unreasonable suppositions, the proper refutation of them is to be sought, and is found, in the world itself. Tracing back geologically the history of this globe, and (after successive revolutions) we arrive at a period, when it contained *no living thing*, and when it was incapable of sustaining any form of life with which we are acquainted. We arrive at a period, when nought terrestrial existed but the bare elements of nature, and when in all probability an existence was imparted even to these.

2. Geology teaches that the earth we inhabit is the workmanship of *one God*. This is evident from the *unity of design* everywhere exhibited in the structure of the globe. The Bible also teaches the same doctrine. The God of the Bible is *one God*—to whom the work of creation is ascribed.

3. Geology teaches that the Creator of the world is a being of infinite *wisdom, power, and goodness*. No one can look into the interior of the earth, and observe its massive structure and multifiform organizations, and not be convinced that its Maker is possessed of unlimited wisdom and power. As little can we doubt the *goodness* of the Creator. To give but a single indication of this. Was there no goodness manifested, on the part of the Creator, in his treasuring up, at a period long anterior to the creation of our race, those measureless *coal formations*, which are now beginning to be exhumed for our comfort and benefit?—No reader of the Bible needs be informed that the creation of the world is *there* ascribed to a Being of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness.

4. Geology teaches that the earth, compared with its Creator, is a *very little thing*;—that he holds it in his hand, and can rock it on its base, and upheave it from its deep foundations, at his pleasure. In literal accordance with this, is much of the language of the Bible. "He taketh up the isles as a very little thing." "He looketh on the earth, and it trembleth; he toucheth the hills and they smoke." "He stood and measured the earth; he beheld and drove asunder the nations; the everlasting mountains were scattered; the perpetual hills did bow."

“His lightnings enlightened the world; the earth saw and trembled; the hills melted like wax at the presence of the Lord.” At language such as this, infidelity has been accustomed to sneer, and shake her head. “She would not believe that there lives a Being able or disposed to effect such stupendous changes in our firmly established world. But geology confirms the solemn facts, as taught by revelation.”

5. Geology teaches that, previous to the creation of man, the earth was chiefly, and often perhaps entirely, *covered with water*. Most of the animals of that period were either marine animals, or of an amphibious character. Most of the plants and vegetables were such as grow in marshes and fens. The stratified rocks from the lowest to the highest, are all to be referred to the action of water. The boulders which occur in the tertiary formations; the regular layers in clay pits and other places below the diluvium, all proclaim that, at the period immediately preceding the creation of man, the earth must have been almost entirely covered with water.—This conclusion is in literal accordance with the representations of Scripture. While the ruins of a previous organization lay formless and desolate, “darkness,” we are told, “was upon the face of *the deep*, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of *the waters*.” It was these tertiary waters which were divided by the firmament on the second day; and were gathered into seas and oceans on the third.

6. Geology teaches that man, and most of the present races of animals, have not existed on the earth more than a few thousands of years. In the transition and secondary formations, and in the deeper portions of the tertiary, we find no traces of human beings, or (with few exceptions) of such animals as now exist. Indeed, it is not at all likely that man could have lived on the earth at that period, had he been placed here. Dragons, and mighty lizards, and other frightful amphibious creatures were then the lords of the creation. It is only in the upper tertiary and diluvial formations, that we find the remains of such animals as now exist, and in some few cases, perhaps, the bones of men. Now this shows conclusively that man, and the present races of animals, are among the comparatively recent inhabitants of the earth. They cannot have existed on it more than a few thousands of years. The Scriptures certify us of the truth of *this* important geological conclusion. They inform us definitely, that man, and the other animals now on the earth, were created less than six thousand years ago.

7. It is a remarkable fact, that in those geological formations which are supposed to have been deposited before the formation of man, there have been found, as yet, no *literal serpents*; i. e. reptiles without legs or fins, and which creep upon the belly.* Of the general class of serpents, or of what would have been serpents, if they had gone upon the belly, there were reptiles in abundance, of various sizes and forms. But they all were furnished with legs, or fins, or wings, or paddles, or some means of locomotion, beyond what belongs to the proper serpent. If this is a fact, as I believe it is, in what way is it to be accounted for? There is nothing certainly in the organization or habits of the proper serpent which unfit him to have lived among the saurians of the secondary formation. On the contrary, all that we know respecting him would seem to adapt him precisely to that period, and to the state of the then existing earth. Why then do we find no proper serpents there, and nowhere, until after the creation of man? The writer of the book of Genesis assigns a reason. On the apostasy of man, the serpent tribe, or a large proportion of them, became divested of some of their more important members, and were henceforth doomed to roll, and gather their meat, upon the naked earth. "*Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat, all the days of thy life.*" Chap. 3: 14.

8. Geology teaches that, at a period more recent than the creation of the present races of animals, the earth has been covered and washed with a *deluge of waters*. The proof of this is furnished everywhere. We cannot dig into a sand hill or gravel pit in any place, without discovering evidence of this deluge. We learn, too, from various indications, such as the deltas at the mouths of rivers, the amount of lava which has subsequently been issued from volcanoes, and the detritus which have fallen from the sides of mountains, that this terrible catastrophe cannot have been a very remote event. We know, from bones which are found in the diluvial formations, that it occurred since the existence of the present races of animals, and probably since the existence of man. The Scriptures inform us definitely *when* this great event did occur, and *why*; and its representations accord entirely with the conclusions of science on the same subject.

* I state this fact according to the best of my knowledge. If I am not correct, I hope some one of our learned geologists will correct me.

9. Geology teaches that the deluge, of which we speak, must have come over the earth *suddenly*, by some violent interruption of the regular course of nature. The waters seem to have rushed with great violence from the north to the south, overtopping the highest mountains, and carrying along with them prodigious quantities of stones and earth. As to the extent and suddenness of the deluge, the Bible teaches the same doctrine. We are told expressly, that the waters covered the highest mountains. We are told too, that the guilty inhabitants of the earth "were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, and *knew not*"—so sudden was the event to them—they "*knew not*, till the flood came, and swallowed them all up." Matt. 24: 37—39. The fountains of the great deep were suddenly broken up, and the waters seem to have rolled over them in one wide wave of instant desolation.*

10. Geology informs us that the same species of animals existed before the deluge, which exist now. Consequently, they must have been, in some way, preserved through the deluge, or (contrary to previous analogy) the same races which had been destroyed must have been re-produced afterwards. The Scriptures inform us that the different kinds of ante-diluvian animals *were* preserved through the deluge, and *how* they were preserved. They were safely lodged with Noah in the ark.

11. Geology indicates that there have been violent volcanic eruptions, near the site of the ancient Sodom and Gomorrah; and that what is now the Dead Sea was, in all probability, sunk in one of these eruptions. The account given in the Scriptures of the destruction of Sodom and the cities of the plain, is altogether coincident with these indications.

12. Geology teaches that, as the earth we inhabit has undergone already repeated revolutions, in which it has been rent from its deep foundations, and the races of creatures existing on it have been destroyed, to give place to others of a more perfect organization; so, in all probability, *another terrible revolution awaits our globe*. It is to be destroyed (so to speak) again; and fitted up again, to be the habitation of nobler races of beings than those which now dwell upon it. Such, reason-

* Without doubt, there was great and incessant rain, at the time of the coming in of the deluge; but that the event was not caused by mere rain, is evident from the nature of the case, as well as from the express language of Scripture, Gen. 7: 11.

ing from analogy, are the deductions of geology, in regard to this momentous subject. And these deductions are in perfect accordance with the teachings of revelation. The present earth is to be destroyed—at least, the present organization of it; after which “we look for a new heavens, and a new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness.” 2 Pet. 3: 13.

13. Geology renders it altogether probable, that the next overwhelming destruction of this world will be *by fire*. The earth is full of the most combustible materials; and it is on fire even now. The smoke of its burning is ascending up from a thousand furnaces. Its molten lavas are belching forth from its heaving bosom, and pouring down the sides of its mountains, and scorching its plains. We have about as much evidence geologically that this earth is one day to be destroyed by fire, as we should have that a house would be destroyed by fire, when we saw the smoke and flame issuing from its roof, and bursting forth from its opened windows. Now the Scriptures expressly assure us that this earth is one day to be destroyed by fire. “The heavens and the earth which are now are kept in store, *reserved unto fire*, against the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men.” “The day of the Lord will come, as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be *burnt up*.” 2 Pet. 3: 7, 10.

14. I shall notice but another of the coincidences between the teachings of geology, and those of revelation. It appears from both these sources of evidence, that we are living, every day, on the sovereign *forbearance* and *mercy* of the Supreme Being. Nothing can be more critical, startling and (were it not for the Divine forbearance) alarming, than is our situation, and that of every other human being, viewed geologically. It is known that the heat of the earth increases, in regular proportion, the deeper we penetrate into its bosom. Should this proportion of increase continue, as we descend into the earth, (and no reason can be assigned why it should not) at the depth of a few miles only we should reach a temperature which would instantly melt the solid rocks. The probability therefore is, that the unknown interior of the earth is *one vast sea of liquid fire*; or at least, that it consists of materials which would instantly take fire, and rage with resistless desolation, the moment they should come in contact with the waters of the ocean

which roll above them. It is these pent-up fires which have already upheaved the mountains, and shaken whole continents in a single earthquake.* It is these which have rived the solid rocks in sunder, and streamed up lavas through them, in the form of trap dykes, for many thousands of feet. It is these which are smoking in the craters of volcanoes, and boiling in their bosoms, in every part of the earth. Here then we live, on a thin and already broken crust, which is extended over a vast ocean of liquid fire. And why do we live here at all? Why do not the smothered flames burst out and consume us? It is only because of the Divine *forbearance* and *mercy*. It is only because, as the Scriptures express it (speaking in reference to this very subject), "God is *long-suffering* to us ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 2 Pet. 3: 9. It is God, in his mercy, who holds these awful fires in check. It is God who puts his great hand, so to speak, upon the smoking crevices of the heaving earth, and bridles in the smothered flames—till all the purposes of his grace are accomplished—till the great *moral* crisis of the world has come,—and then its *physical* crisis will come in a twinkling. Then the impatient fires will be let loose, and the whole frame of nature will be speedily dissolved.

In view of the interesting and important coincidences here noticed between geology and revelation, it surely is not enough to say of the former science, that it is not inconsistent with revealed religion. It is the handmaid of revealed religion. Its voice, on a great many points, is but the echo of that louder and more intelligible word, which proceeded from ancient men of God, who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The inquisition which has been made in modern times into the interior structure and past history of the earth *demonstrates* that the God of nature is the God of the Bible, and that this holy book may be depended on, as a faithful exposition of his truth and will.

The time is within the recollection of many now living, when infidel writers were confident in their anticipations that the discoveries of the geologist would overthrow utterly the system of revealed truth. Brydone, Voltaire, and the French

* The earthquake which destroyed Lisbon, in 1755, was felt in Iceland, and in other places in the north of Europe;—an indication that its cause must have reached nearly to the centre of the earth.

infidels generally *exulted* in the belief, that a light was beaming from the bowels of the earth, which would confound the advocates of Scripture, and explode utterly the christian revelation. The issue of these high and boastful expectations is now before us. The investigations of geologists have been prosecuted (as they should have been) with the utmost ardor. Every accessible point, whether of mountain height or of ocean depth—of mine or cavern—of island, shore, or volcanic steep, has been explored ; and the conclusions of all respectable geologists are now decidedly in favor of Christianity. The more distinguished geologists, both of our own country and of Europe, are professed Christians. Several of them are christian ministers. Instances might be mentioned, in which geological investigations have served to remove doubts in regard to the Divine authority of our sacred books, and confirm the unsettled faith of the skeptical inquirer. And why should they not ? The coincidences which we have traced between the teachings of geology and those of revelation are sufficient to convince any one, that the consistent geologist *must be* a Christian ;—that the unbelieving and undevout *geologist* is mad.

The disappointment of infidels in regard to the results of geological inquiry is not a solitary one. A great many of like nature have been inflicted on them, in the progress of investigation on other subjects. A few of these it may not be inappropriate very cursorily to notice.

Within less than a century it has been confidently pretended, that human beings are of *different races*. They are not all the descendants of a common father. God hath not “made of one blood all the nations of men, that dwell on the face of the whole earth.” The representations of the Bible on this subject are false. “None but a blind man,” says Voltaire, “can doubt that the whites, the negroes, the Hottentots, Laplanders, Chinese, and American Indians, are distinct races.” This assertion of the sage of Ferney, like most of his other impious assertions, was echoed and reëchoed by his numerous satellites. But in the *present* stage of scientific inquiry in regard to the natural history of our race, the man who should utter such a sentiment would be scouted. It has been satisfactorily ascertained, after the most careful metaphysical and anatomical research, that the human family are unquestionably a *single* family, and that the declarations of Scripture on this subject are true.

It has been pretended, within the last century, that the dif-

ferent *languages* spoken on the earth are so immensely numerous, and so widely distinct, as to give the lie to the account in Genesis, as to the confusion of tongues. This subject has been investigated anew, and investigated with great care and labor. The result will be presented in the language of a learned archaeologist of the present day. After having expressed the opinion that the radically *distinct* languages spoken on the face of the earth are few, Dr. Wiseman adds, "We are driven to the conclusion that, on the one hand, these languages must have been primarily united in one, whence they drew the common elements essential to them all; and on the other, that the separation between them, which destroyed no less important resemblances, could not have been caused by any gradual departure, or individual development, but must have been occasioned by some violent, unusual, and active force, sufficient alone to reconcile these conflicting appearances, and to account both for the resemblances and the differences."* Such is the conclusion of mere scientific research, in regard to the different languages of men. It must be evident, at a glance, how exactly it accords with the representation given in the Bible.

Within the last two hundred years, the friends of revelation have been often assailed with the pretensions of some of the nations of the East to a prodigious antiquity. The Chinese and Japanese, the Egyptians and Hindoos, we have been told, possess unquestionable historical records, and astronomical observations which carry back their origin to thousands and perhaps millions of years previous to the Mosaic account of the creation of man. The taunts and sneers, the boastings and exultations of infidel writers and talkers on this subject, have been loud, and confident, and long. But with persons of information, of whatever religious sentiments, they have come to a final end now. The whole matter has been investigated; and the result is, that after every allowance which can reasonably be made, the Chinese, Japanese, and Hindoos have no claims to an antiquity higher than the days of Abraham. Egypt was settled at a very early period; but there are no traces of Egyptian history until about two centuries after the deluge. It would be impossible here to go into particulars on the interesting subject of antiquities; and yet there are a few incidents too amusing and instructive to be altogether passed over.

* Lectures, etc. p. 67.

Less than fifty years ago, an Egyptian relic called the zodiac of Dendera, was transported into France. It was covered with unintelligible figures and hieroglyphics, and was declared by the infidel savans to be of a very remote antiquity. They did not doubt that it had existed long anterior to the Mosaic account of the deluge, or even of the creation. But at length the hieroglyphics are deciphered, and the hand writing on the zodiac of Dendera is read; when it appears, that it dates back only to the time of the Roman emperors, somewhat later than the commencement of the christian era!

In the last century, there was a Hindoo work, strongly resembling, in many points, the christian Scriptures, translated from the Sanscrit, and published. It was called the Ezour Veda. Voltaire pounced upon it at once, declared it a work of great antiquity, and had no doubt that the leading facts of the New Testament were borrowed from it. What then is the history of the Ezour Veda? The matter has been fully investigated, so that there is no longer any doubt or uncertainty respecting it. The Ezour Veda was written by a Jesuit missionary, in the year of our Lord 1621, and with a view to promote Christianity among the Brahmins of India.

It used to be said that the account given in Exodus of the building of the tabernacle could not be true; because the materials composing it could not have been furnished at that early period. The arts were not sufficiently understood. But it has been recently discovered that the arts were at their *greatest perfection* in Egypt, at the time when the Israelites sojourned there, and became "skilled in all the wisdom of the Egyptians."

It used to be said, on the authority of Herodotus, that the ancient Egyptians drank no wine; and of course that the story of Pharaoh's butler, recorded in Genesis, could not be true. But the researches of Champollion and others have settled the question, that ancient Egypt abounded in vineyards, and that its inhabitants were in the constant use of wine.

It has been said a thousand times that, admitting the Scriptures to have been originally inspired, they may have been essentially corrupted. The copies have been tampered with; they have been interpolated. Passages have been foisted in, and foisted out, to suit the convenience of interested individuals, till we can have no confidence in the accuracy of what remains. To this, it need only be said in reply, that the subject has been

laboriously and critically examined, and it has been ascertained, to a demonstration, that the various readings are of *no essential moment*. They are somewhat numerous, as might be expected, the books having passed through the hands of thousands of transcribers; but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, they consist in the mere accidental change of a letter, or a point, which makes no essential variation in the sense.

These instances have been introduced for the purpose of showing, that the disappointment of infidels, in regard to the results of geological inquiry, has not been their only disappointment. It is but one among a great many others of a similar character. Defeated in one course of inquiry, they have fled to another; and foiled here, they have resorted to a third. They have appealed to the heavens for a confutation of our sacred books. They have cried to the sun, and moon, and stars, 'Come, curse ye them from thence.' They have uttered the same cry to the rocks and caverns of the earth, 'Come, curse ye these hated books from thence.' They have looked to hoary legends, and crumbling monuments, and the catacombs of ancient kings, and have said in despair, 'Come, curse ye them from thence.' But the curse, in every instance, has been turned into a blessing. And so it always will be. Scientific investigations, fairly and thoroughly conducted, must always turn to the furtherance of Christianity. For what is science, but a knowledge of nature's laws? And what are nature's laws, but rules which the Supreme Being—the *God of the Bible*, has prescribed to himself, in carrying into effect his vast designs? The God of nature and the God of the Bible are identical; and hence a consistent and thorough investigation of nature—the more thorough the better—must *always* tend, as in the case of geology, to illustrate the nature and support the evidence of Bible truth. None but smatterers, dabblers in the study of nature, as a general thing, become infidels, or are in any particular danger of becoming such. Was Newton an infidel? Were Boyle, and Bacon, and Leibnitz infidels? Were Cuvier, and Davy, and Bentley infidels? Yet before these hierophants in nature's temple, the puny infidels of modern times may well retire abashed, and "hide their diminished heads."

"No system ever laid itself open more completely to detection, if it contained any error, than that of Christianity. No book ever gave so many clues to discovery, if it tell an untruth,

as the sacred volume. In it we have recorded the earliest and the latest physical revolutions of our globe ; the dispersion of the human race ; the succession of monarchs in the surrounding countries, from the time of Sesostris, to the Syrian kings ; the habits, manners, and languages of various nations ; the great religious traditions of the human race ; and the recital of many marvellous and miraculous events, not to be found in the annals of any other people." Add to this, that it is the work, not of one hand, but of many, between whom there could have been no collusion or design ; and I appeal to the considerate reader, if there ever was a book which, if untrue, if an imposition, presented so many chances for detection and exposure. And yet its leaves were thrown fearlessly open, from two to three thousand years ago, to the investigation of philosophers and critics—to the scrutiny of friends and foes. Its leaves have lain unfolded from that time to the present, inviting discussion—inviting research ; saying virtually, like its great author, '*Testify against me, if you can ;*' and it has passed the ordeal ; it has stood the test. Its evidences, so far from being weakened by the labors of critics, the researches of philosophers, and the lapse of time, are becoming continually strengthened. Dark passages are brought out into light. Seeming discrepancies are reconciled. What were regarded as difficulties two hundred years ago are found such no longer. " Every science, every pursuit, as it makes a step in its own natural, onward progress, increases the mass of our confirmatory evidence." The very efforts of infidels are made to recoil on their own heads and are over-ruled for the establishment and advancement of the gospel. And shall Christians tremble now, for the safety of their precious ark ? Shall they fear now, that the progress of any real science can shake the foundation of their hopes ?

There are many Christians, it may be feared, who have no practical conception of the unmoveable security of that foundation on which it is their privilege to stand. They are easily terrified at appearances. The boastful pretensions of some infidel hypothesis, some misnamed science, alarms them. Or what is worse, they are drawn away, it may be, for a time, from the clear shining of the light of heaven, to follow in the glare of some meteor, or mock sun. The subject here discussed is calculated to impress upon all Christians the folly of such terrors—the guilt and danger of such aberrations. In the faith of the gospel, we have a rock beneath our feet ; and it is our own

fault if we leave it, and become lost and buried in the sands. "We have a sure word of prophecy, to which we do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place ;" and it is our own fault, if we turn from it, in the pursuit of wandering stars.

There will be dreams and visions, plausible theories and lying vanities, in days to come, as there have been in days past. There will be false pretenders to science, speaking great swelling words, and leading unwary souls astray. But let the Christian possess himself in perfect peace, as most assuredly he is in a situation of perfect security. The storm may rage around him for a season, but it will pass over. The lightnings may flash and the thunders roar, but they will ere long be hushed. And Christianity will come out of every new trial, as it has out of every previous one, strengthened in its evidences, and not weakened—victorious, and not vanquished.

But in speaking thus confidently of the truth of Christianity—of its eternal, inflexible truth, are those who profess it aware, in all cases, of what they affirm? *What is Christianity? What does the sacred volume teach?* Its conclusions, in many points, are coincident, as we have seen, with those of science ; but in various other points, it discloses what no mere science ever taught, or ever can. It publishes truths—and this is the reason why it has been so violently assailed—truths, humbling to the pride of man, startling to his fears, wounding to his carnal peace, and fatal to his unfounded hopes. It tells of *guilt*—awful guilt ; and of impending *judgment*—awful judgment. It tells of a Deliverer, who saves all that embrace and follow him, but who punishes all others with an aggravated condemnation. It tells, not only (like geology) of melting elements and burning worlds, but of a great white throne, and of him who is to sit upon it, before whom the earth and the heavens are to flee away. It shows us the rising dead, the assembled worlds, the opened books, the final awards. It shows us heaven—and it shows us hell. It calls us to look upward, and behold the unmingled joys and glories of the saved. It permits us to look downward, and listen to the wailings of the lost.

There are truths (and they *are* truths, if Christianity is true) which, for solemn interest and impression, cast all others into the shade. Here are truths, on the heights of which the Christian may plant himself, and look far down upon mere questions of science, as manhood looks upon the baubles of infancy, or as angels may be supposed to look upon the trifling pursuits of men.

Of the reader of these pages, may I be permitted to inquire, before we part, *Do you believe the truths of the Bible?* Dare you disbelieve them? Or perhaps I might better inquire, *Dare you believe them?* Dare you feel, and live, and act, in all your intercourse with the world, as though the Bible was the truth of God?

I know there are some, who are very ready to profess their belief of the truth of Christianity, and then *live* as though there was no truth in it. But what good can such a belief of Christianity do? Must it not to those who persist in it, do immense hurt? Must it not deepen the stains of their guilt, and aggravate their final condemnation?

I know, too, that there are some, who would receive Christianity in the gross, while they reject it piece-meal. They would have the credit of receiving it, while they are bent upon explaining away its solemn truths. But what good, I ask again, can such a reception of Christianity do us? What good can the mere covers of the Bible do us—although they be gilded covers—when its precious contents are all torn out? What good can the chapters and verses, the words and the letters of the Bible do us, when their solemn meaning is discarded?

Assuredly there is but one course which those who have the Bible, and who profess to believe it, can with propriety pursue. Let them henceforth *live* as though it were true. Let them shape their faith and form their characters according to it. Consistency requires as much as this of them; and the God of the Bible requires no more. A character consistently formed on the basis of the Scriptures is a christian character and entitles its possessor to the Christian's reward.

ARTICLE II.

THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH, HEAD OVER ALL THINGS; ILLUSTRATED BY ANALOGIES BETWEEN NATURE, PROVIDENCE, AND GRACE.

By W. S. Tyler, Prof. of Languages, Amherst College. [Concluded from Vol. XI. p. 363.]

8. The *order of proceeding* in nature, providence and grace alike is *gradual*. The processes are never hurried, often exceedingly slow. The growth of the plant, the animal, the man is by almost imperceptible gradations. Human *character* and *condition* are formed and decided by steps equally gradual. And the same is true of the *christian* character and state.

Look at the same law of order on a larger scale. The work of creation occupied six natural days according to the common understanding of the sacred record. According to the interpretation of many philologists, and the records of geology, many thousand years were occupied in preparing the earth to be a suitable habitation for man.

How slow is the process of *civilization*, and the progress of society. All Europe was overrun with savage tribes from its first peopling till the supremacy of the Roman empire, and the larger part of it remained in a savage state till after the reformation. It was only within a century, that government began to be administered for the good of the people; and according to the analogy of past history, many and many a year must roll away, before this will become the end of all government.

We need not be surprised then at the slow progress of *revelation* and *spiritual renovation*. The human race lived 2000 years without any written revelation, and 2000 years more had elapsed, before the canon of Scripture was completed. A third period of 2000 years has almost passed away, and not one fourth of the human race bear so much as the *christian name*. Not one fourth of *these* have the Bible in their own tongue and are able to read it; and of these again, not one fourth probably are real and spiritual Christians. Yet the process has been ever going on and is destined to go on, till the world is converted.

There is the increasing twilight, the gradual dawn, and the slowly advancing day alike in nature, providence and grace.

Everywhere, in every thing in our world, infancy, childhood, youth, manhood succeed each other by almost imperceptible stages.

9. This law of order is not only gradual but *progressive*. There is a gradual process of *improvement* or *advancement* alike in nature, providence and grace. “*First the blade, then the ear, then the full-corn in the ear.*” “The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth *more and more* unto the perfect day.” These similes rest on the analogy between the natural and the spiritual worlds, of which I am speaking; and exhibit the order of every thing, which we see under the divine government. If “*order* is heaven’s *first law*,” *progression* is its *second*, and no less *universal*, than the first. *Particular* illustrations without number will be suggested from the similes of the Bible and from every reader’s own observations and reflections. We will confine our attention to the following of a more *general* nature.

According to the first chapter of Genesis, the order of creation was as follows: first inorganic matter, then successively grass, the herb yielding seed, the fruit tree yielding fruit, reptiles, the monsters of the deep, the fowls of the air, the beasts of the field, the cattle after their kind, and man in the image of God. There is obviously a constant progress from good to better, from less perfect to more perfect forms of organization and modes and ranks of existence. Now whether geology presents us with a record of this *same* creation, as some maintain, or as others hold, carries us back to an *earlier series* of creative acts succeeding each other at long intervals, all agree, that it exhibits the same general law of progression from the rudest mineral up through successive stages to the most perfect animal—from mere chrysalization to vegetation, from improving vegetation to dawning sensation, from advancing sensation to commencing sagacity or intelligence, and from rising intelligence to reason and moral sense, where the progression ceases to be *transferred* from one species to *another*, but will go on in the *same* species through the countless stages of improvement, to which man is destined during an endless existence.*

* “Geology shows us, that organic beings became more and more perfect from the commencement of life on the earth to the time of man’s appearance.”—*M. Rozet*.

See also Buckland, chap. 12. Says Kirby (Bridgewater Treatise

It cannot be denied, that there has been a progression in the *providential development* of nature's resources to the knowledge and use of man. Look back upon the history of our own country and you see a condensed but faithful epitome of the world's history in this respect.

Little more than two centuries ago, the savage roamed undisturbed over the whole continent, beheld with superstitious amazement or stupid indifference all the energies and operations of nature, and suffered the pangs of want and starvation amid all the exuberance of fertile prairies and teeming forests, mighty rivers and grassy meadows, tropical suns and fertilizing showers.

But the forest has been gradually felled and the prairie subdued; boundless fields of grain and fruit drink in the rain and the sun-shine; the produce of every clime is borne on the mighty rivers, wafted by the wind that whistled idly along their channels, or propelled by steam, that has been elicited from their own waters by fuel, which once stood embowering them above, or lay imbedded beneath and by their side, and where thousands starved, millions now live in plenty and luxury and hundreds of millions might live upon the new and vast resources, which are in a process of daily development. Throughout the world, society on the whole has been on the advance, government has been gradually improved in theory and in practice, the arts and sciences have multiplied and advanced, and the means of subsistence and happiness have greatly increased. There seems to be in society a capacity and a tendency to progress unto perfection, which it is not unreasonable to suppose it may attain in another and a better world.

Religion has also been progressive. Universal idolatry was followed successively by the patriarchal, the Mosaic and the christian dispensations, each of which was a great advance upon its preceding era. The true religion was confined at first to a

chap. 4.) "The first plants and the first animals are scarcely more than animated molecules and appear analogous of each other; and those above them in each kingdom represent jointed fibrils. It is singular and worthy of notice, that the Creator after the creation of inanimate matter probably first imparted the living principle to bodies of the same form with the molecules and fibrils, into which that matter is resolvable, thus uniting by common characters things essentially distinct, and preserving unbroken that wonderful chain, which links together all created things."

single family, then to a single nation. Under the last dispensation, it is enjoined as a sacred duty to propagate it among all mankind, and the church feels more and more every year her obligation and ability to set up in all the earth, that kingdom, which "consists in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Divine revelation was at first only a faint streak of light glimmering in the East ; like the natural sun, it rose gradually into view, till it became full orbed ; it has ever since been rising higher and higher above the obscurity of the horizon, and breaking more and more through the mists and clouds of earth ; in its meridian splendor, it will enlighten every land ; and it will never decline from the zenith, but fade away in the brighter glories of the Lord God and the Lamb in their upper kingdom. Such then is the law of God's universal government :

"From seeming evil still educating good,
And better thence again and better still
In infinite progression."

There have been *exceptions* to the law of progression in religion. There were sad relapses among the Jews, and Christianity has had its dark ages.

But even here the analogy holds. There have been exceptions to the progress of *society*. Society has had its relapses and its dark ages.

And there were exceptions to the law of progression in the successive *creative acts* which *geology* discloses.* There was a general advance from lower to higher grades of existence. But *occasionally* more perfect organizations, both animal and vegetable, are found to prevail *with* or even *before*, the less perfect. As if the Creator, while he usually proceeds according to established rules, intended to show by occasionally departing from them, that he is not necessitated to abide by those rules.

It is worthy of a passing remark here, that in the development of nature, providence and grace to the *view* and for the *benefit* of *man*, there is usually a progress or a relapse *together*. Witness the dark ages, when the three kingdoms seemed to be all shrouded in darkness—when the light of natural science, of social knowledge and virtue, and of spiritual wisdom seemed at

* Buckland, Chap. 12. p. 115. London, 1836.

once to have been extinguished. Look again at the reformation, when the eclipse passed off simultaneously from nature, providence and grace, and they all shone out with unprecedented lustre. In our own day, it were difficult to say, whether discoveries in nature, improvements in society, or the propagation of Christianity are advancing with the most rapid strides.

10. The *types* and *prophecies* of revelation are not without analogy in nature and providence. That is, there is something in the constitution and course of nature so *analogous* to the typical and prophetic parts of the Bible, as to remove all a priori objections against them and even create a presumption in their favor, yet not so nearly *resembling* them as to invalidate their *special* sacredness—their peculiar claims to an immediate divine origin.

As the former dispensation in religion was typical of the latter, so in the earlier stages of *nature*, there seems to be something like types of the later stages. The organs of the earlier species of animals were comparatively *rude* and *imperfect*, yet they were *similar* organs to those of the later species and performed similar offices—offices as similar as their situation and circumstances would allow. The *common mind* would not condemn it as a misnomer to call the forms and features of the monkey types of human forms and features. The *naturalist* finds such types * far down the scale, and far back in the history of animal life. It was this correspondence of parts throughout the animal kingdom, which led Lamarck to broach the theory, that all animals, including man, are but the same species, having the same essential organs, but developing them more fully and perfectly as time advances and circumstances become more favorable. Though clearly false, the theory was founded on indubitable and interesting facts. It is now settled, that the animal species are radically and incommunicably distinct; and the resemblances in general organization between the earliest ruder animals and the later and more perfect animals, result not from natural propagation, and the favor of circumstances, but from creative power exerted at successive periods and according to such a law, as to constitute the first ages, “*shadows* of better things to come.”

* Type is the very word which naturalists have chosen to express the analogy between the earlier and ruder organizations on the one hand, and the later and more perfect organizations on the other.

Moreover as the rites and institutions of the former dispensation were not less wisely *adapted* to the character of the Israelites and the then state of the world, than those of the latter dispensation are to the present character and condition of mankind; so the organization of the earlier animals was no less wisely adapted to the then state of the earth's surface, than the organization of the later animals is to its present state. Buckland discovers in the entombed remains of the old world, as clear and beautiful marks of design and adaptation, as Paley finds in the living world. Each religious dispensation was *perfect* in its *time*, each grade of animal organization *perfect* in its *place*.

In the *developments* of nature and providence to the *age* of *man*, the past often contains something typical and almost prophetic of the present and the present of the future. "Coming events cast their shadows before," and seers of nature and providence are raised up, who, though they "know not precisely what, or what manner of time is signified," are yet enabled to discern and predict in some measure what is to come. Such seers were Burke and Adams,* who foretold the issue of the French and American revolutions; and Newton and Leibnitz, who had a glimpse, and threw out hints, of most subsequent discoveries in natural science. Seneca foretold the discovery of a new world,† and Socrates and Plato anticipated the advent of a *divine teacher*, advising to forego the usual sacrifices till such a teacher should come, and "representing with prophetic sagacity and precision that he must be poor and void of all qualifications but those of virtue alone, that a wicked world would not hear his instructions and reproofs, and therefore in three or four years after he began to preach, he would be persecuted, imprisoned, scourged, and at last put to death."‡ It cannot be denied that great men have occasionally been endowed with a peculiar gift of descrying future events and forewarning their

* The allusion is to a youthful letter of the elder Adams, which paints the revolution and its issue with much truth and beauty.

† Venient annis saecula seris,
Quibus Oceanus vincula rerum
Laxet, et ingens pateat tellus,
Tethysque novos detegat orbes.

Senecae Medea, 374—8.

‡ See Harris's Great Teacher, p. 50, where it is suggested, that Socrates and Plato enjoyed a degree of inspiration.

less gifted contemporaries of what they may hope or fear. Why then should prophetic inspiration in the manner and degree, in which it is claimed by some of the sacred writers, be thought a thing so incredible a priori, that no amount of evidence can entitle it to credence? The same God who endowed Newton and Leibnitz, Adams and Burke, Seneca, Socrates and Plato with sagacity and foresight so much above the mass of their contemporaries may have given, nay, *has* given to Isaiah and Jeremiah, Daniel and John a prophetic vision so much surpassing the ken of these gifted minds, that every candid reader of their predictions must acknowledge them to be divine.*

* I am aware that this analogy has been more frequently used, (and therefore at first view may rather appear,) as an infidel objection, than as a confirmative argument to inspiration. One reason for presenting it here, is a desire to exhibit it in a different aspect and relation. It should be remembered, that an analogy is "an agreement or likeness between things in *some* circumstances or effects when the things are *otherwise* entirely different."—(*Webster*.) Prophetic sagacity and prophetic inspiration "agree" in so far that God bestows peculiar gifts of foresight upon the possessors of both, yet differ so much in the number and degree of the gift, that they can be confounded only by a very stupid mind, or a very corrupt heart. They come under one very broad general principle of the divine administration, so that the one serves to illustrate and confirm the other, but the *mode* of the divine agency is so different in the two cases, as not to invalidate the peculiar claim, and the sacred authority of inspiration.

It has been the belief of every nation in every age, that their great men were inspired, and pagan nations have entertained views of the nature and manner of inspiration strikingly analogous to those, which the Bible authorizes. Infidels have urged this fact as a proof, that there is no such thing as real inspiration. But it proves the contrary, just as the shadow, proves the existence of the substance and the counterfeit shows the existence and the value of the genuine. It shows, that God has laid a foundation for inspiration in the constitution of the human mind, upon which we should expect him to set up a corresponding superstructure. If he intended to impart inspiration, it would be wise to implant in man a preparation and an expectation to receive it; and having implanted such an expectation, it were strange indeed, if he should never meet it.

On this last topic, which I have introduced merely to illustrate my design in the text, see Knapp's Theol. Art. I. § 9. Most of the objections of infidels, when rightly understood, are really arguments in favor of Christianity; and instead of shrinking from the view of them ourselves and endeavoring to keep them out of sight of others, we should lay hold of them and turn them against infidelity.

11. In the universal law of progression, of which I have spoken, the earlier stages are preparatory to the latter stages, and the latter reap most of the advantages of the former together with many peculiar advantages. This is obviously true in the kingdom of grace. The patriarchal dispensation was introductory to the Mosaic, and the Mosaic preparatory to the Christian; while the Christian, with all the benefits of former dispensations, combines many advantages peculiar to itself. The Israelites lived not for themselves, but to be examples unto us; and their history was written "for our admonition, on whom the ends of the world are come." We have the accumulated wisdom and experience of the church in all past ages to guide us in the management of ecclesiastical affairs and in the discharge of our religious duties.

So it is in society. The progress of society is owing in no small degree to the wisdom derived directly or indirectly from past ages. The Grecian and Roman republics were constituted and administered not for themselves only, but for the instruction and benefit of all subsequent republics. All the despotisms and limited governments of the Old world have risen or fallen, maintained their institutions or modified their policy, for the benefit of the New, whither light from every quarter and every age has converged. All that have lived before us, have lived for our admonition, on whom the ends of the social and political world are come.

It is so in *nature* also. Ever since man was placed on the earth, its surface has been undergoing changes, all preparatory to the present state of things—all conducive to the support and comfort of its present increased and increasing population. Our alluvial meadows and extending deltas, our beds of peat and bog iron, our collections of vegetable mould and indeed all our existing soils are the gradually accumulated resources of successive generations. And if the conclusions of geology are not to be set aside, a similar process of preparation and accumulation for the benefit of man was going on for ages previous to his existence. The whole of the earth's surface* is a spacious storehouse of relics and treasures, which have been collecting in all past times to supply and enrich mankind in time of need,

* "No small part of the present surface of the earth is derived from the remains of animals, that constituted the population of ancient seas."—*Buckland*.

just as society and the church at the present time are built upon the ruins of other churches and societies, instructed by their experience and enriched by their remains. We draw our fuel and our food, our comforts and our delicacies from the remains of vegetable and animal life* in former ages ; and as the matter, which constitutes the bodies of the present generation once entered into the constitution of other bodies, so the opinions and feelings of our minds are the opinions and feelings of other minds modified by constitutional idiosyncrasies, improved by experience and enlarged by the accumulations of time and the favor of circumstances. It seems to be a law of the natural and the moral world, that man shall grow only by living upon the relics of his predecessors, rise only by standing upon the tombs of his fathers, extend his vision only by looking from the monuments of the mighty dead. Dissolution is going on everywhere in our world, but it is everywhere preparatory to another and a better organization. One race of animals is destroyed, and a more perfect race succeeds them. One generation of men goeth and a wiser and better generation cometh in their stead. Society and the church are perpetuated and improved by the very processes of disruption, which seem to threaten their annihilation. Death bears a most important and wonderful part in the whole economy of vegetable, animal, social and spiritual life. The plant decays in the autumn and lies down in a wintry grave, only to revive in all the freshness and gaiety of spring. The insect becomes its own winding sheet, and then unconscious awaits a resurrection to a higher order of existence. The nation declines and falls, to rise again under a better form and happier auspices, and to attain to a higher degree of social perfection. The human body "is sown in corruption, to be raised in incorruption—it is sown in dishonor, to be raised in glory."† The soul, like the butterfly (which in the Greek language—the language alike of nature, of philosophy and of reve-

* "At the sight of a spectacle so imposing, so terrible, as that of the wreck of animal life, forming almost the entire soil on which we tread, it is difficult to restrain the imagination from hazarding some conjectures as to the causes, by which such great effects have been produced."—*Cuvier*.

† In view of the analogies to the resurrection, with which nature is so replete, no wonder that Clement, the apostolic father, exclaimed: "Consider, my beloved, how the Lord shows us our future resurrection perpetually!"

lation—has the same name,*) drops its clayey chrysalis to spread its pinions in a purer atmosphere, and bask in the brighter sunshine of a celestial day. The natural world, like the fabled phenix, its allegorical representative, will one day rise from its own ashes and wear a new drapery of beauty and glory.† And the church, the city of the living God on earth, will be dissolved only to be built again into the New Jerusalem, the capital city of the new heavens and new earth, whose walls will be precious stones, its gates pearls, its streets pure gold, and the Lord God and the Lamb the temple and the light thereof.

12. After our Saviour had manifested his creative power by feeding a great multitude with a few loaves and fishes, he showed his economical wisdom by saying, “gather up the fragments which remain, that nothing be lost.” The same blending of these apparently incongruous attributes is conspicuous in all the works of God. Nothing can transcend his power, when he sees fit to exert it, and nothing can exceed his economy, when the exercise of power is unnecessary. He creates nothing to be lost, provides nothing to be wasted, gives nothing that need not be given. He might have created fertile soils at once, and provided fuel as it was needed, but he chose by a natural and gradual process to collect them as they were not wanted and preserve them till they were. He might have made a plentiful deposit of useful minerals and precious ores on every farm, but he has chosen to scatter them in veins or beds beneath the surface of the earth, and employ our skill and energy to discover and procure them. He might have revealed the natural history of the primeval earth to us in his word, but he chose not to reveal what we might better discover for ourselves, and he has left us to gather that history from the organic remains of primitive ages.

In his providence, God might have led every age and country to make its own inventions and discoveries and improvements, but he has chosen the more economical course of transmitting them from one age and country to another. And he

* *ψυχη*, the name at once of the soul and of the butterfly—its image.

† 2 Pet. 3: 12, 13. This doctrine of revelation is confirmed by natural science—by the philosophy of cause and effect, no less than the philosophy of analogy.

has suffered nothing truly valuable * to be lost. We often think and regret, that important knowledge has perished forever, but in process of time it proves to have been unimportant, or it is revived just at the time, when it is most needed, and in just such a way, as to render it most curious, interesting and valuable.

In like manner, God might have communicated a distinct revelation to every people of every generation. But what it was man's power and privilege to do, he has left him to do, and made it his duty to collect the scattered portions of revealed truth, promulgate them to all nations, and transmit them to the end of the world. He has communicated barely what it was needful for man to know, and what he could not learn from reason and experience, and of all that has been revealed, there is no evidence, that any thing has been lost.

Thus in all his works, God does all that is necessary, however much it may cost, and nothing that is superfluous, however easy it might be—gives nothing that is not valuable, and suffers nothing that is truly valuable to be irrecoverably lost.

13. Another analogy, which forces itself upon our attention as pervading the divine works, is an obvious disregard of human distinctions—i. e. such distinctions of time, space, rank, etc. as men are wont to deem important.

We who are of yesterday and die to-morrow, and are subject to incessant changes and vicissitudes from the day of our birth to the day of our death, attach great importance to the distinction of time. But in the sight of him, who is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, “a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years.” Accordingly men are hurried and fretful in their proceedings, impatient of delay, and ever hastening to the issue. But the divine plan of operations is calm, gradual and deliberate ; and though in some of its stages, it may appear imperfect or unwise, it will ultimately prove to have originated and advanced in perfect wisdom.

The divine, untaught in science, looks upon the geological theory of the earth's existence for indefinitely long periods before the creation of man, and exclaims : “ How absurd ! What ! the earth tens of thousands of years in a fluid state—a state of ignition even, devoid of living beings or inhabited only by salamanders ! And hundreds of thousands of years more, entirely

* Perhaps I should have said nothing essential—nothing whose place cannot be otherwise supplied.

or chiefly covered with water, devoted to the formation of limestone and coral beds, and inhabited only by polypes and lizards and alligators, et id omne genus! For ages without any inhabitants, and for myriads of ages, inhabited only by irrational and hateful animals without any intelligent lord! Who can believe that the Creator was guilty of such weakness and folly!*

On the other hand, the infidel geologist looks upon the theological doctrine of the slowly successive periods of revelation, and the protracted delay of the work of redemption with like incredulity and amazement. "What!" he exclaims, "hundreds of generations of immortal beings suffered to live and die in ignorance of God and a future state, and that God revealed to them for the first time in flaming fire, and that future state disclosed only to their agonized sensibilities and their hopeless, endless despair! The only possible scheme of human salvation delayed in its execution for 4000 years, and for 2000 years longer promulgated only to a small minority of the human family! Who dare utter or believe such a libel on the wisdom and goodness of God!"

Now both these objections spring from ignorance and narrow views. The divine, untaught in science, and the geologist, ignorant of revelation, both see, that in some of his works God disregards those distinctions of time, to which we attach so much importance; while they both deny that he acts on the same principle in his other works! But the principle is universal. Revelation lays it down as a general principle, that in his sight, "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day;" and reason would lead us to expect, that the infinite and eternal God would not view time as it appears to us.†

So also the distinction of space and rank, are disregarded by

* Is it any less difficult to believe, that the universe was a blank for eternal ages before a single creature existed? Yet so it must have been, unless creatures have existed from eternity. Capt. Symmes argued, that the earth is hollow, because it was absurd to suppose God would occupy so much space with mere inert matter!

† The man, who is neither a divine nor a naturalist, (shall I add neither a Christian, nor a scholar,) is the only man who can consistently urge either of the objections specified in the text. He must give up all claim to consistency, who professes to be either, and yet does not admit, that the same objection which he urges against his antagonist, is equally valid against himself.

him, who pervadeth alike the atom and the universe, and to whom the loftiest and the lowest of his creatures, are alike less than nothing and vanity. The sceptical philosopher declares it to be unreasonable and incredible, that the God who makes, and sustains, and governs an infinitude of worlds, should so concern himself with our little world, as to give his Son to die for its redemption ; and still more improbable that he would condescend to such a concern for obscure individuals, as is implied in the doctrines of a particular providence, personal election, and the indwelling of the spirit.

The illiterate Christian, on the other hand, cannot believe that there are many hundreds of shells once enshrining living animals in a grain of limestone,* and myriads of animalcules in a single drop of water.† And many an educated Christian thinks it beneath the Almighty to people a world with polypes, and muscles, and snails, and alligators, and lizards, etc. etc.

But he *has* given up two thirds of the earth's surface to the fishes and monsters of the deep, and peopled a large portion of the land with lizards, and serpents, and vermin ; and may he not have left the whole earth for a time, without an intelligent lord, to be overrun with inferior animals, animals, which we in our reasoning, yet erring pride, are prone to despise ? He has created infinitely more animalcules than larger animals, and may not he, who creates them, redeem man ? He does form and feed sumptuously every day the snail, and lizard, and serpent, so loathsome and odious to *us*, though not to *him* ; and may he not elect, and dwell with, and provide for the humble Christian, number the very hairs of his head, and cause all things to work together for his good ?

These things are all true, and all spring from the same general principle in the divine government, such a disregard for the distinctions of space and rank, as leads him to lavish his bounty and his grace on places and creatures, which seem too minute to deserve the attention of the great Sovereign of the universe. "If there be one thing" says an eminent naturalist,

* "Soldani collected from less than an ounce and a half of stone found in the hills of Casciana, in Tuscany, 10,454 microscopic chambered shells. Of one species of these shells, he calculates, that a thousand individuals would scarcely weigh one grain."—*Buckland*, p. 117.

† "Hundreds of thousands (of the sufusoria) may be seen in a single drop of water."—*Kirby's Bridgewater Treatise*.

“ more surprising than another in the investigation of *natural phenomena*, it is perhaps the infinite extent and vast importance of things apparently little and insignificant.”* What intelligent reader of the Bible, and of the history of the church, can avoid seeing, that the same characteristic feature pervades the spiritual world from the fall of man in Eden to his complete restoration and final confirmation in the Celestial Paradise !

14. The same end is sought in each of the three kingdoms, viz. the highest happiness of the creature, and the glory of the Creator.

The God of the Bible appeals to his chosen people of old, to say, what more he could have done for them, than he had done ; and in the gift of his Son, he makes the same appeal to Christians in the melting eloquence of that tone, which language cannot express.

The God of nature manifests a like intention, an effort, so to speak, to secure the utmost amount of happiness. Every element teems with animal life—every spot is replete with happy existence. The desert air swarms with insects ; the wilderness and the solitary place are full of inhabitants suited to the locality.

“ So is the great and wide sea, wherein are things creeping innumerable, both great and small beasts.” The sea is as amply furnished with vegetables,† and the larger animals, as the land ; while the drops of the former like the particles of the latter are densely peopled with animalcules.‡ To multiply happy existence still more, thousands of animals, beyond the number which the vegetable world is capable of sustaining, subsist by preying upon others ; and the very carcasses of animals, that die a natural death, furnish food for a numerous army of scavengers, which, while in the act of providing a suitable diet

* So also Pliny : See his *tam parvis, atque tam nullis, quae sultis, quanta vis, quam inextricabilis perfectis.*

† Marine, like land animals, depend upon the vegetable kingdom for subsistence, and Brongniart has shown that the existing submarine vegetation seems to admit of these great divisions which characterize to a certain degree, the plants of the frigid, temperate and torrid zones.—See *Buckland*, p. 451.

‡ The powers of reproduction in the Infusoria are such, that from one individual, a million were produced in ten days ; on the eleventh day four millions, and on the twelfth, sixteen millions.—*Buckland on the authority of Ebsenberg*

for themselves, remove what would otherwise prove a source of annoyance and disease to other animals.”*

And the modes and forms of animal existence are not more multiplied and varied, than are the contrivances to render life happy. Natural history is little else than an enumeration of manifest proof, that the character of the Deity is wisdom and goodness, and the end, at which he aims, is the happiness of his creatures.

And the history of God's dealings with man, teaches, as a whole, the same lesson. Every organ of his frame, every element in his constitution, every event in his life is designed and adapted to promote his happiness. If he abused no part of his original constitution, and perverted no bounty of providence or gift of grace, he would be entirely happy ; and the miseries he suffers, are intended to secure his ultimate highest happiness by reclaiming him from past, and deterring him from future abuses and perversion. Moral beings can be happy only by being virtuous and holy, and all the provisions of providence and of grace, are directed towards the great object of making them happy in that way. For this object, God inflicts natural and providential evils. For this object, he subjected his beloved Son to untold agonies. For this object, in part at least, he will punish forever the incorrigible sinner. And I know not how

* “No sooner is the signal given, on the death of any large animal, than multitudes of every class hasten to the spot, eager to partake of the repast, which nature has prepared. If the carcass be not rapidly devoured by rapacious birds, or carnivorous quadrupeds, it never fails to be soon attacked by swarms of insects, which speedily consume its softer textures, leaving only the bones. So strongly was Linnaeus impressed with the immensity of the scale, on which these works of demolition by insects are carried on in nature, that he used to maintain, that the carcase of a dead horse, would not be devoured with the same celerity by a lion, as it would by these flesh flies (*Musca vomitoria*) and their immediate progeny ; for it is known that one female will give birth to at least 20,000 young larvae, each of which will in the course of one day devour so much food and grow so rapidly as to require an increase of 200 times its weight ; and a few days are sufficient to the production of a third generation. The very bones are the favorite food of the hyena, whose powerful jaws are peculiarly formed for grinding them into powder, and whose stomach can extract from them an abundant portion of nutriment. No less speedy is the work of demolition among the inhabitants of the waters, etc.”—See *Rodget's Bridgewater Treatise*, Vol. 2, p. 49.

a Being of infinite benevolence, would exhibit more convincing and affecting proofs of his regard for the highest happiness of the universe, than in the very pains, which he inflicts so unwillingly upon the children of men, and the agonies, which he laid upon his beloved Son, for the sake of securing a higher degree of happiness on a larger scale.

The highest possible amount of happiness, is also the aim and tendency of that universal law of progression, which we have already considered. An infinite progression of goodness and happiness, will produce a greater sum total, than any changeless state, however exalted; just as the sum of any progressive infinite series in mathematics, however small the first term, is greater than the sum of any unchanging infinite series, however large the fixed term may be. How delightful it is to the enlarged and benevolent mind, to contemplate the onward and upward progress of a holy and happy universe through infinity! Who can sum up that progression! Who can grasp, even in imagination, such an aggregate of excellence and bliss! Oh, they know little of God, who deny his benevolence, little of his universe, who think it not made to be a happy universe!

With the happiness of the creature, the glory of the Creator is associated, as the end of all his works. That glory consists in the display of his glorious attributes, and the exhibition of those attributes, is manifestly a chief end of nature, providence, and grace.

Is the natural creation a display of his power? So is the new spiritual creation.* Does the system of nature illustrate his wisdom? The plan of redemption illustrates it more.† Is the goodness of God conspicuous in his works of creation? It is not less conspicuous in his works of providence and grace. Is his terrible and resistless justice set forth in his providential dispensations? These exhibitions of his displeasure at sin, are premonitions of that great day revealed in the Scriptures, when he will judge the world in righteousness. Is the uniformity of nature's laws and operations, a standing monument of his truth and fidelity to his promises? The prophecies fulfilled and fulfilling, the promises and threatenings of his word executed, likewise shows his veracity.‡ He is at once the author, the sub-

* Eph. 1: 19. Ps. 110: 3.

† Eph. 3: 10.

‡ This analogy is often adverted to in the Scriptures. Ps. 119: 89, 90. Matt. 5: 18.

ject, and the object or end of the book of nature, the book of providence, and the book of grace. All his works are dedicated to himself—to what other being could they with propriety have been dedicated? They treat of himself, the greatest and best subject. They speak of him consistently and harmoniously. One book may speak more of his natural, and another, more of his moral attributes. One may treat of some particular topics which are omitted in another, or may discourse of the same topics more clearly and fully; but God is the sum and substance of them all, his character their subject, and his glory, their end. “All his works praise him, and all his saints bless him.” In nature, the heavens declare his glory, and the firmament showeth his handy work. In providence, day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge of him. And the great end, for which the church is established, is to show forth the praises of him, who called its members out of darkness, into his marvellous light. Every thing animate and inanimate, voluntarily and involuntarily, responds to the call of the “sweet singer of Israel:” “praise ye the Lord;” and the student of nature, and the observer of providence, may unite with the Apocalyptic seer, and say: Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever.

I might specify other analogies. I might adduce the intimate analogy between the doctrine of social liabilities in this life, with which nobody thinks of finding any fault, and the proper doctrine of the imputation of Adam’s sin, and of Christ’s righteousness, of which multitudes complain; in other words, the analogy between what we actually suffer and enjoy in consequence of our involuntary connection with others in this life, and what we are alleged in the Scriptures to suffer and enjoy, in consequence of the constituted connection between us, and the first and second Adam. I might speak of that uniformity amid variety, which forms so characteristic and interesting a feature both in the constitution and course of nature, and in the composition and operation of the Bible—which pervades the vegetable, animal, and spiritual kingdoms, the forms and features of mankind, their languages and social institutions, and their moral and religious characters. I might advert to that happy

blending of beauty with utility, which constitutes a striking analogy between the divine works and the divine word ; in the former of which natural religion joins hands with the music and poetry of nature, while in the latter, revealed religion is “wedded to immortal verse.” I might mention that simplicity of means, which exalts the divine wisdom so far above all human skill, and which is so well expressed in those oft cited lines,

“ In human works, tho’ labored on with pain,
A thousand movements scarce one object gain.
In God’s, one single can its end produce,
Yet seems to second, too, some other use.

But why should I specify. The whole natural world in its constitution and laws, its particular and aggregate, is a counterpart of the spiritual world.* Every object in the former, is a kind of image or type of something in the latter. Nature is a preliminary dispensation, like the Mosaic, true and holy so far as it goes, insufficient by itself, imperfectly understood without a further revelation, but when thus understood, illustrating and confirming the Christian dispensation. The temple of nature, like Solomon’s temple, is full of types and shadows of heavenly things, though the “candlestick” of Christianity must be lighted up in it, before they become distinctly visible. Have not the flowers a language, and the brutes a voice, to teach us the domestic, the social, the Christian virtues ?† Read Pollok’s description of nature’s preaching.

“ The seasons came and went, and went and came,
To teach men gratitude, and, as they passed,
Gave warning of the lapse of time, that else
Had stolen unheeded by. The gentle flowers
Retired, and stooping o’er the wilderness,
Talked of humility and peace and love.
The dews came down unseen at eventide,
And silently their bounty shed, to teach
Mankind unostentatious charity.”

Read this, and much more of the like nature in the context,

* The writer does not mean to countenance the mysticism of the Hutchinsonians, or the subtle speculations of the Platonists, but simply to present the external world in that intimate relation to the spiritual world, which it sustained in the mind of the sacred writers, who certainly saw everywhere marks of the divine presence, and emblems of heavenly things.

† Matt: 6: 26—30. Prov. 6: 6—8. 30: 24—28. Isa. 1: 3.

and say, whether it is all poetry, or whether the objects of nature, and the events of providence do in truth teach us lessons of spiritual wisdom. Follow, above all, in the train of our Saviour, and as he utters his parables, and delivers his sermons, see all nature a picture-gallery filled with likenesses and sketches of heavenly things. Indeed it is a striking characteristic of all the sacred writers, that they find memorials, and types of God and heaven in every natural object and event; and the allegories, the similes, all the figurative language of the Bible, is a standing illustration of the analogies that pervade the realms of nature, providence and grace.

Now I need not spend time in establishing the inference from these numerous and striking analogies, that the realms in which they prevail, have the same head. When we see similar laws administered in a similar manner, in different provinces, and the same characteristic features prevailing, with only those differences which diverse circumstances require, we infer that they are under the same government. The same striking and characteristic peculiarities of sentiment, style and imagery, prove the books in which they are found, to have the same author. When I apply these principles to the present subject of discussion, I am constrained to believe that nature, providence, and grace, are provinces governed by the same head, books written by the same great author. I would as soon believe that man administers the providential government of the world, as that he devised and established the church; and when I come to the conclusion that man made the heavens and the earth, then I may be ready to believe that unaided man was the author of the Bible.

A few remarks, which are suggested by the foregoing discussion, but could not conveniently find a place in it, will close this protracted article.

1. Analogy affords us the best means of answering objections both against science and religion. The scientific man has few objections to urge against religion, which do not lie with equal force against nature and providence; and the religious man has few objections to urge against science, which if valid at all, would not be equally valid against religion. Press hence upon both the analogy, and if you do not convince, you will silence. Does the philosopher object to the theological doctrine of divine sovereignty? Show him, that the same doctrine is written on every page of nature and providence. Does the theologian

charge with absurdity the prolonged processes and protracted periods of Geology? Point him to the fact, that his own science and his own sacred books disclose similar processes and periods. Does the skeptic scout the idea, that eternal life is suspended on so pusillanimous a trait as humility, and so involuntary a principle as faith? Show him, that the requirement of these virtues, so far from being arbitrary, accords with the nature of things, and that the knowledge and happiness of this life are suspended on the exercise of the same virtues. Does the Christian doubt, whether God would condescend to create myriads of infusories in a drop of water, or people a world with successive generations of irrational creatures? Remind him that God has condescended to provide for, and redeem a world of sinners, "whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed before the moth, and who are accounted to him as less than nothing and vanity." Does the fatalist pretend, that his exertions for salvation are rendered fruitless by the immutable purposes and laws of God? Tell him, that he would not for a moment stake any temporal good on the principle of that objection, though all temporal good is equally dependent on immutable laws and purposes. In like manner, we may answer almost every objection of the scholar against the Christian, of the Christian against the scholar, and of the man, that shows any common sense about any thing, against both the scholar and the Christian. He must either be a perfect model of consistency, or make no pretensions to it; in other words, he must be either an angel or a fool, whose errors cannot be corrected by analogy. If ministers would employ evangelical reasoning more, and abstract reasoning less, they would be more successful in conciliating practical and hurtful error. On the other hand, why need they forget, that analogy is not more truly a "powerful engine" than an impartial one, which if not applied by themselves to the correction of their own errors, will be wielded against them by others to their no small discredit, if not their utter discomfiture.

2. It is very important, that the teacher of religion, and quite desirable, that the private Christian, should be a student of nature and an observer of providence. Besides silencing objectors and confirming his own faith, he would thus find fresh light and beauty shed upon the truths of religion. Nature and salvation are parallel columns in God's universal harmony, and

providence is a divine commentary upon them both. Should they not be studied together?

Coleridge somewhere remarks,* that he admired Shakspeare's wisdom and power on a first perusal in his youth, and on reading him a second time after years of study and improvement, Shakspeare's wisdom and power appeared to have increased quite as much as his own. This remark is far more applicable to God's works, than to those of any mortal. The more wisdom and power we bring to the study of them, the more we discover in them. Each increase of the magnifying power of the telescope, is attended with a corresponding accession to the extent, beauty, and grandeur of the visible universe. Every improvement of the microscope discloses new beings, new wonders, new and more delicate strokes of a divine artist. The observer's mental vision, too is improved, not to reach the full height, nor penetrate the whole depth, nor range all the compass of nature's mysteries, but while he solves one of these mysteries, to discover more than one, which he leaves unsolved. So that the Philosopher, who now looks out upon the divine works from the highest vantage ground, with the most acute and profound mind and the most perfect helps to his ocular and mental vision, may well feel, as did the immortal Newton, that he has scarcely glanced along the shore, and discovered a few beautiful shells; while before him spreads the unexplored and illimitable ocean of truth.

The Bible is also boundless in the compass of its truths, exhaustless in its treasures and beauties. Its contents seem to enlarge in extent, and magnify in importance, and increase in variety and interest in precise proportion to the progress of society, and the improvement of the individual reader. So that the Christian, who knows the most, not only sees the most to admire in what he has read, but expects to find the most, that is new and admirable in his future study of the sacred volume; and so far from ever feeling that he has comprehended its whole scope, or exhausted all its riches, he will be ready to exclaim, "it is high as heaven, what canst thou do; it is deeper than hell, what canst thou know; the measure thereof is longer than the earth and broader than the sea."

Now if knowledge of every sort is a help to the acquisition of further knowledge, (and it is, for every truth stands more or

* I give only the substance of the remark from memory.

less related to every other truth,) a portion of the knowledge of one class of God's works, will help us to acquire a knowledge of another class. Familiarity with one of Shakspeare's dramatic pieces helps to understand and appreciate another. The student, who has mastered one production of a classic author, will master another production of the same author at once more easily and more perfectly. Why should not this principle apply to the different productions of the Divine mind? Has it not been so in the *past* study of the Divine works? It was the knowledge and influence of the Bible, that gave the first impulse and the first clue to the discovery in natural science; and fresh discoveries in natural science are ever impelling and guiding in the study of the Bible, explaining many particular passages, and correcting in general wrong modes of inquiry.

What new grandeur and glory pervade the universe, when viewed in the light of the Bible, as created, pervaded and controlled by one Omnipotent, omniscient, Almighty and all-wise Spirit! Others may prefer the theogonies and cosmogonies of pagan Greece and Rome, and sigh for the hills, the fountains and the groves, the Muses, the Naiads, and the Nymphs of those classic lands, but,

"Sion hill

Delights me more, and Siloa's brook, that flowed
Fast by the Oracle of God ;"

and,

"The heavenly muse, that on the sacred top
Of Oreb or of Sinai did inspire
That Shepherd, who first taught the chosen seed,
In the beginning, how the heavens and earth
Rose out of Chaos;
And chiefly that Great Spirit, who doth prefer
Before all temples the upright heart and pure."
Hence is to be drawn the inspiration of "adventurous song
That with no middle flight will surely soar
Above the Aorian mount, while it pursues
Things unattempted yet in prose or verse."

The classics contain exquisite poetry, but the Bible surpasses them in exquisite poetry, I had almost said as much as in pure morality and sound philosophy. Nature is grand and beautiful and instinct with life, as portrayed on the classic page. But

the universe, as seen in the light of revelation, is more beautiful and grand, animated by a purer, and loftier Spirit, and lighted up with a brighter, diviner radiance.

On the other hand, how has science shed light upon the Bible! With what new interest have modern discoveries invested such passages of Scripture, as the first chapter of Genesis, fortieth of Isaiah, and the eighth Psalm. The modern Astronomer, any enlightened Christian of these days, sees a beauty and sublimity beyond the conceptions, may I not say, of David and Isaiah themselves in such descriptions as these: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; what is man that thou art mindful of him, or the Son of man, that thou visitest him." "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure. All nations before him are as nothing, and are counted to him less than nothing and vanity." All such descriptions, all the illustrations of the divine wisdom and goodness in the Bible, will be enhanced in beauty and sublimity and impressiveness in exact proportion to our increasing knowledge of the divine works. A perfect system of mental science, should such a system ever be discovered, would probably add to the clearness, with which we understand, and the power, with which we realize divine truths, no less than the discoveries in natural science have already done. So far then from being alarmed at the progressive influence of science upon religion, it is with emotions of delight too big for utterance, that I look down the tract of time and see with the eye of faith science and religion pouring a flood of light upon each other; seal after seal broken, and page after page of surpassing beauty and glory opened to view simultaneously in nature and revelation; doubts removed and mysteries explained; the elements conquered, and the passions subdued; man reclaimed, and God honored; and the world at length irradiated with the blended beams of a sanctified literature and an enlightened Christianity. To the men of that happy day, "heaven alone will indeed be but a reward for heaven enjoyed below." To behold the dawning of that day, and pray and labor for its approaching consummation, is a privilege, which prophets and kings of former times never enjoyed.

3. It is the duty and the interest of every man to fall in with the analogies—the harmonious arrangements—of nature, provi-

dence and grace. Take an illustration of my meaning. It has been already observed, that nature, providence and grace in their development to man usually advance together, and that all are making simultaneous and gigantic strides in our own day. It becomes us then to notice the point towards which they converge, the end to which they are advancing. Do I mistake in saying, it is the conversion of the world? See in heathen lands walls of prejudice and caste and despotic power, high as heaven and hard as adamant, prostrated to make way for the Gospel; see at the same time in christian lands resources accumulated in the hands of benevolent men, associations formed on the broad scale and in the enlarged spirit of universal christian philanthropy, means of conveyance improved, languages mastered, rags converted into Bibles, sailors into missionaries, and the elements into winged messengers—all united to convey the Gospel to the ends of the earth; and even if you did not see the church awakened to an unprecedented interest in this specific object, could you doubt, that the era for the world's conversion is approaching? And is it safe for you to oppose, is it wise for you to neglect, are you willing to stand aloof from an enterprise, which nature, providence and grace are coöperating to achieve?

The same questions, or similar questions may be asked respecting most of the analogies and divine arrangements, which we have been considering.

Humility and faith, sustain the same important relation to the kingdom of nature, the kingdom of providence and the kingdom of grace—they are necessary and profitable for all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and also of that which is to come. Is it then consistent with your duty and interest to denounce the one as a mark of meanness, and the other as an arbitrary requirement?

To coöperate with God is the highest honor to which man can aspire—to resemble God, the highest perfection to which he can attain. Instead of finding fault then, with that arrangement which requires a union of divine and human agency in every important concern, we should humbly and gratefully acknowledge the condescension and love of God in permitting us to coöperate with him in his benevolent designs, and be equally ready to avail ourselves of his gracious aid, and render to him our poor but faithful and devoted service.

While we fall in so far as possible with his plan of operations,

we should endeavor to act ever on general principles, to be guided by general laws, and to render to them as uniform and complete obedience as if they were self-executing.

Though we have no right to do evil, that good may come, we may strive to resemble God, and rejoice that we live in a world, where we can resemble him, and coöperate with him, in bringing good out of evil, order out of confusion, and light out of darkness.

So long as we do our duty, we should not allow our faith to be shaken or our feelings to be greatly disturbed by the slow process of human amelioration on the one hand, or the sudden and violent revolutions that may occur on the other, but should be "steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord," following the leadings of Providence, promoting in God's wise manner, God's holy and benevolent end, the progress of ourselves and others in knowledge and virtue, the highest happiness of the creature and the greatest glory of the Creator.

To return from these particular illustrations to the general principle of this head. The laws of nature, providence and grace, are all laws of God, all alike obligatory, and all clothed with the same sacred authority. "He that offendeth in one point is guilty of all." He that wittingly violated one of the codes, arrays them all against him. But he who obeys them all, will find that they conspire most happily to aid each other, and to bestow a great reward. It is not enough to obey only the natural, or the providential, or the moral laws. Duty is fulfilled, happiness is secured, by universal and perfect obedience. He only is an educated man, who has been trained to the utmost of his ability to "discover, apply and obey all the laws, by which God governs the universe." He, who has been thus trained in the school of nature, the school of providence, and the school of grace, he is an educated man, educated for time and for eternity, educated for earth and educated for heaven. Whether he is engaged in temporal or spiritual concerns, whether he undertakes to reform men in this world, or prepare them for the next, he will not go against wind, tide and current, but he will do it in the way of divine appointment, in accordance with all the divine laws and with the harmonious coöperation of all the divine attributes.

ARTICLE III.

THE THEOLOGY OF SOCRATES, FROM XENOPHON'S
MEMORABILIA.

Translated from Schweighauser's *Opuscula Academica*, by F. M. Hubbard, Teacher of a
Classical School, Boston.

Θαυμάζω, ὅπως ποτὲ ἐπεισθίσαν Ἀθηναῖοι, Σωκράτην περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς
μὴ σωφρονεῖν, τὸν ἀσεβὲς μὲν οὐδὲν ποτε περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς οὔτ' εἰπόντα,
οὔτε πράξαντα, τοιαῦτα δὲ καὶ λέγοντα καὶ πράττοντα περὶ θεῶν, ὅλα τις
ἂν καὶ λόγων καὶ πράττων εἴη τε καὶ νομίζοιτο εὐσεβίστατος. Xenophon
Mem. I. 20.

Preface.

AMONG the most precious relics of ancient writers, which have escaped the tooth of time, that wears away all things, most justly deserve to be ranked Xenophon's *Memorabilia* of Socrates; because they are the production of one who was well called the Attic Bee, and yet more because from them alone, as from a pure fountain, we may learn the principles of the life and philosophy of the Prince of ancient wise men. For whatever, in this book, Xenophon has delivered to us of the morals and doctrines of his master, bears every mark of truth, and thoroughly answers to the idea of that dignity, which by all ages has been ascribed to Socrates. Every where are conspicuous an earnest desire of searching out and communicating truth, a strong purpose of deriving from all knowledge some advantages for the life of men, of turning others from error and leading them to piety, to pure morals and to true wisdom, by instructions and by example; in fine, an excellent method and simplicity in discussion, which found their way to the persuasion of every man, and by which, most of all, the Socratic philosophy commended itself to all antiquity; so that we cannot hesitate to render full confidence to Xenophon. But in consulting Plato, another of the sources for the Socratic doctrine, much caution is needed. For he usually ascribes his own opinion to Socrates, and very frequently differs from Xenophon, of whose faithful record there can be no doubt, or introduces Socrates disputing about subtile and knotty questions, from which, we know he carefully abstained, or indulges too

far his own poetic genius, and forsakes the peculiar simplicity of his teacher. Since therefore we cannot employ the testimony of Plato without danger of error, and our purpose to set forth *the teachings of Socrates concerning the Deity*, forbids us to engage in a critical discussion on the discrepancies of authors, we shall take Xenophon only for our guide, and collect and arrange what this defender of his master has stated in different places, and attempt by brief reasonings to make clear some points which he has touched but lightly. But that we may better show what advances Socrates made in the knowledge of the divine mind, we will present a rapid sketch of the state of theology in Greece before his time.

SECTION I.

AN OUTLINE OF THE STATE OF THEOLOGY AMONG THE GREEKS BEFORE SOCRATES.

§ I. *The older Poets and Priests.*

The religion, which the oldest priests and poets had taught, was yet in its vigor in the age of Socrates, and none are ignorant of what absurd fables it was composed, and how utterly unworthy of the Divine majesty. Having fashioned their system after the measure of human weakness, imputing to the gods, wars, seditions, adulteries, and every crime, and sanctioning every error of man by the example of a god and sometimes also wrapping up in impious fables their theories of the material world, and constructing cosmogonies not less monstrous than ingenious, they aided to degrade religion by the very sweetness of their poetry; and while they did much to refine and soften rude and fierce spirits, they also filled the life of men with superstition.* For what can more engender contempt for a God, and enkindle every lust, than to hold, that God himself is

* Cicero *de Natura Deorum*, I. 16. II. 24 seqq. III. 24 seq. The disputants whom Cicero introduces in these places, inveigh too severely against the poets; who yet were not wholly free from blame; for though they had no intention of making men superstitious, and desired rather to please than to instruct, they really taught error, and a false opinion of the Deity, to uncultivated men, and who could not well distinguish the false and the feigned from the true.

the author of depraved desires ? which surely gives free license to all lust, and all wickedness. Nor was the influence of the priests confined within the walls of temples, or restrained to the affairs of private life. It reached to public business and the administration of the State, and often by lying oracles, mysteries, and other rites which wrought upon the imagination of superstitious men, became of more effect than the best counsels of the wisest statesmen.

§ 2. *The older Grecian Philosophers.*

Neither did the ancient philosophers of Greece bring a clearer light to theology,—the Ionic, the Pythagorean,* the Eleatic, Empedocles, Heraclitus, Leucippus, etc. For they, while they bestowed great labor in investigating the nature of all things, were accustomed chiefly to dispute concerning the principles from which all things arise, and into which they may be resolved ; also concerning efficient causes, which they placed in abstract notions, or sometimes even in mere words which hardly implied a notion, as friendship and hatred, numbers, accident, necessity, etc. From these principles and notions, with mere hypotheses founded on no observations, they vainly attempted to explain and demonstrate, by subtile disputation, how all things were formed. But the true cause of all things, God, the creator and governor of the universe, they knew not, or kept their knowledge of him far away from their researches in philosophy.†

§ 3. *Anaxagoras.*

Already, had Anaxagoras, who a little before the age of Socrates, stood forth the glory of Greece, begun to dispel the thick darkness, which hitherto enveloped and buried the knowledge of the Deity ; and first uttered the opinion that the form and measure (*descriptio et modus*) of all things had been devised by the wisdom and wrought out by the power of an infi-

* The error of those who have given the Pythagoreans credit for a clear knowledge of the unity of God, has been refuted, with many arguments by Meiners, in his treatise *de vero Deo*, p. 296 seq.

† Meiners, in the work just referred to, p. 248, seqq. has fully and accurately explained the various opinions and systems of these philosophers, respecting the cause of things.

nite mind.* But his doctrine was still too much encumbered with the dreams and barren questions of the natural philosophers of that age, nor was it made conducive to the regulation of human life, by a devout worship of the true source and governor of all things; nor did it reach the common people,† to whom the form of his speculations was but ill adapted.

§ 4. *The Sophists.*

We now come nearer the times of Socrates himself, when flourished a class of teachers, for many purposes useful, but pernicious for those most important, who were called Sophists.‡ These men following the steps of the philosophers, who had gone before them, devoted themselves to the investigations of natural science. They were the first, after the States of Greece had grown rich, who became professed teachers of various arts, and systems of learning. They bestowed their labors, not without great personal advantage, on the promotion and improvement of eloquence. Sometimes, even, they were rewarded with public gifts and honors conferred by States. Young men were committed to their care, that they might prepare them for both public and private life, by imparting an extensive and various knowledge of affairs. With the people, who purchased at the highest prices the teachings which they sold with an undisguised ostentation, they had immense power, not only by their eloquence but by their personal authority. But this confidence and admiration of Greece they most basely abused. They burned with an incredible love of glory and of gain.§ They endeavored, with impudent and iron front, to persuade

* Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, I, II. Plato in *Phaedone*, Tom. I. p. 221. seqq. Ed. Bipont.

† Plato, l. c.

‡ The passages, which pertain to the history of the Sophists, a history mainly to be gathered from Plato, have been collected by Meiners, in *Geschichte der Wissenschaften*, etc. Vol. II., where he has explained at large their philosophy, arts, and manner of life; topics on which the plan of our inquiry will allow us only to touch.

§ These two faults gradually made the name of the Sophists, exceedingly odious in Greece. Plato in *Protag.* Tom. III. p. 93. Ed. Bip. in *Sophista.* Tom. II. p. 213 seqq. So Cicero, *Acad. Quaest.* IV. 23. "They are called Sophists," says he, "who philosophise for the sake of ostentation or of gain."

all men, that they were the only teachers of wisdom, the only guides to happiness, to virtue, and to honors. They taught amid the multitudes, surrounded by the noblest and most promising youth of Greece. They proposed questions, and professed themselves ready to dispute on any topic which any one might wish to hear discussed, that they might win the applause of the unthinking crowd.* They delighted to accumulate money, to sustain the expense of delicate and luxurious living, to provide for the indulgence of every pleasure and every lust. Naturally, therefore, they studied and followed the popular caprice, affirmed the prejudices of the multitude, and by following, swayed their blind impulses, at their own will and to their own purposes.

We may readily conjecture, that a class of men of principles and manners so base and corrupt, could not but exert a most pernicious influence on the youth of Greece, by instructions not less corrupt and base. Some entertained unworthy and degrading opinions of the Deity. Others denied that there be Gods. They taught that all things, which are or may be, are, or may be, by nature, or accident, or art; that the sun, earth, moon, stars, are such, by chance and nature, not by an intelligent wisdom; that all things in the world are but some compound from a chance concurrence of opposites, heat and cold, dryness and moisture, the soft and the hard, etc.; while other things which have uses for human life, music, painting, medicine, agriculture, knowledge of civil affairs, are the product of art alone, or of art combined with nature. But in nature, say they, are no gods, but only in the subtle contrivances of governments, some of which have instituted one and some another, as a politic restraint on the passions of men.† Religion being set aside, the

* Hippias furnishes a good example of the ostentation of the Sophists. At the Olympic games, in the audience of almost all Greece, he boasted, that there was nothing in any science which he did not know. Cicero, *de Orat.* III. 32. In reference to the same peculiarity, Xenophon calls the Sophists, τοὺς πάντ' οἰομένους εἰδέναι, *Mem.* Lib. I. 4. 1.

† Plato, *de Legibus* X. *sub init.* In the same place, Plato complains, that the Greeks were infected with three errors, which the Sophists seem either to have taught, or if the popular opinion had already embraced them, to have confirmed. Some denied altogether the being of the gods. Some, while they allowed that there are gods, supposed them too far elevated above human affairs, to care

obligations of justice were easily disposed of, which, from the endless disputes of men about it, they contended, rests on no firmer foundation, and that the only just right is that of successful violence.* What need of more words? They extended their protection to avarice, to the inordinate love of glory, to impure pleasures, to all acts of baseness. Virtue they mocked at. Besides, they well knew how, with rare art, in subtle and captious questions, to entangle their adversary, as in a net. In fine they were strong in a fatal skill to unsettle the notions of men on all subjects, which concern the security of public and private life; and by ever calling good, honorable and just, what the universal sense of men has reckoned wrong, base, and unjust, and the reverse, (that is by involving all things in crooked and knotty reasonings) they at last persuaded men actually to esteem them so. To be able to maintain any doctrine, on any topic, was the characteristic and mark of a Sophist.

SECTION II.

SOCRATES AND HIS THEOLOGY.

CHAP. I.

SOME PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE MANNER AND TEACHINGS OF SOCRATES.

§ 5. *The peculiar character of his Mind.*

Not only were the minds of the Greeks infected with these envenomed and fatal doctrines of the Sophists, but growing riches, as they are wont, had opened a free access to every indulgence, when Socrates appeared with his more salutary teachings. Yet even he would have attained no measure of success in his schemes of reforming men, had he not been sustained by a so great, and as it were, divine impulse of genius, by such peculiar piety, temperance, constancy, and, in fine, by a firm per-

for and control them. (Cf. Xenophon, Mem. I. 4. 10). And some, while they maintained their being and a providence, thought they could be easily appeased and bribed by human service, like the fickleness of men. (Mem. I. 1. 19. I. 3. 3.)

* Plato. l. c.

suasion that God himself had called him to philosophy.* Errors were to be shaken off, with which himself had been imbued from his early youth; superstition, neglect of the gods, the prejudged and inveterate opinions of his fellow citizens were to be warred with and overcome; and highest task of all, the Sophists were to be displaced from their influence and authority. And most manifestly, he trod a different path from that of those usurers of wisdom. They arrogantly declaimed ambitious and boastful orations; Socrates in popular discourse and in familiar conversations discussed the conduct of human life.† The Sophists abjured truth and virtue; Socrates undermining by apt questions their insidious sophisms, restored exiled truth and virtue to his country. The Sophists demanded of their pupils large sums of money; Socrates despising illiberal gain, received never a price for his instructions.‡ The Sophists were splendid in their equipage, effeminate, and luxurious, unjust, and contemners of the gods; Socrates, a man of few wants, not neglectful of his person nor yet over nice, patient of heat and cold, frugal, just, pious.§ Such was the diversity in habits and morals between our philosopher and his adversaries. Auxiliary to these virtues were an uncommon suavity of manners, and a certain native sweetness of disposition, and colloquial humor. Thus armed, Socrates with little difficulty, gained the friendship of noble and ingenuous youth, whom he aided in the acquisition of a knowledge truly useful, and trained to the love of virtue and of honor.

§ 6. *The peculiarity of the teaching of Socrates.*

Impelled by weighty reasons,|| Socrates omitted to consider the questions, alike without the scope of the human intellect,

* Plato in *Apologia Socratis*, p. 67. Ed. Bip.

† Xenophon, *Mem.* I. 1. 16. I. 2. 18. IV. 7 and elsewhere.

‡ *Mem.* I. 2. 5. and 60. 6. 5. and elsewhere.

§ *Mem.* I. 6. 1. §§ 11. 18. 20. IV. 4, etc. Socrates never sought to attain an empty reputation, by singularity and uncouthness, like Diogenes the Cynic, but only avoided a Greek like effeminacy, and followed the precept which Seneca, (*Epist.* V.) has expressed, "We are to aim at a better life than the mass of men pursue, not a contrary one; else we put away from us, and beyond our influence, those whom we wish to amend."

|| The reasons may be found in *Mem.* I. 1. 11 seqq. and IV. 7. 6.

and distracting it from the duties of life, concerning the primary elements of all things, the universal nature, the origin of things, etc. which former philosophers had vainly labored to explain, and *first*, as Cicero says,* *called down philosophy from the heavens, and gave her a dwelling in cities, and made her even an inmate in our families, and forced her to search out the truths of life and morals, and things good and evil.* For, seeing to what extent, virtue and religion, the foundations of the security of human society, had been undermined by the fallacious reasonings of the Sophists, with how little solid knowledge of affairs the young rushed into the administration of the State, and how erroneously on most subjects men judged, from their ignorance of the true intrinsic value of things, Socrates was used to define what is pious, what impious; what honorable, what base; what just, what unjust; what wisdom, what folly; what courage, what cowardice; and other things, of which it were a shame for a good and honest man to be ignorant.† Most of all therefore did Socrates deserve well of the republic, for which he formed good, just, and well instructed citizens; of the discipline of morals, the ideas of which he settled by accurate definitions; and especially of theology, for he sought with no scanty measure of success, for one whose reason was his only guide, after the author and governor of the universe. For he first informed the minds of men with a more salutary idea of the divine nature, and bearing a nearer similitude to the true; and made such attainments even, that he not only left far behind him the philosophers of former ages, but left almost nothing to be discovered by the acute inquirers, who in after years were guided by his light. No one indeed of those who followed Socrates, although they may have demonstrated the being of a God by a greater number of arguments, or may have more fully investigated those which he brought forward, has surpassed his master, in a clear and well assured knowledge of God, in piety

* Tusc. Quaest. V. 4.

† Mem. I. 1. 16. All these subjects Socrates calls *human*, under which term he seems to have included every thing which pertains to the life of man, and tends to promote its happiness, so that from this class would not be excluded the knowledge of the divine mind. To *human*, he opposes *divine* and *celestial*, which terms embrace all that pertains to physics, and especially as it was taught in that age, to general cosmology, or the natural theory of the universe.

and the application of theology to the formation of moral principles and habits. Nay, since he had well surveyed the limits of human intellect, (as we may infer from his whole mode of philosophizing) and devoted himself to the investigation of those subjects which do not transcend those limits, he wisely avoided* the errors of many later inquirers, who have busied themselves in questions beyond the reach of human knowledge, and which have no relation to human life.

The philosophy of Socrates is most highly commended by the method he used in communicating his instructions. This method is set forth by Xenophon, Lib. IV. cap. 6, but is better seen in the Socratic Dialogues, preserved by the same writer. The great art of Socrates lies in this, that starting from certain truths well known by experience to all, by various very simple questions to which the respondent cannot but answer rightly, he led him to perceive a necessary connection between what Socrates would teach him, and that which himself had conceded to be clear and unquestionable. From the use of this method men were induced more readily to admit the instructions of Socrates, because they seemed not so much to have learned from another, as to have taught themselves.

We shall now proceed more closely to our purpose, and attempt more exactly to unfold the doctrine of Socrates concerning God. This examination naturally divides itself into two parts, the first of which is the doctrine of Socrates concerning the nature of the Deity, and is chiefly to be derived from the *Memorabilia* Lib. I. cap. 1. and 4. and Lib. IV. cap. 3. The other part is the doctrine of Socrates concerning divine worship, which is best explained in Lib. I. cap. 3. and Lib. IV. cap. 3. and 6.

* Balbus, apud Ciceronem de *Natura Deorum*, Lib. II., the defender of the stoical philosophy, uses, for demonstrating the existence of a God, almost every where, the arguments of Socrates, only more widely investigated and applied; and so long as he treads in his footsteps, he is close upon the confines of truth, but the moment he oversteps the limits prescribed by Socrates, he is involved in errors. Again and again were it to be desired that a greater number of those who were trained in the discipline of Socrates, had persisted in his plan, and never, swayed by a fondness for novelty, departed from the noble and admirable simplicity of their master. From a perverse desire to bring forward something of their own, they have often exchanged his truth for their own falsehood.

CHAP. II.

PART FIRST. OF THE THEOLOGY OF SOCRATES; OF THE NATURE
OF GOD.§ 7. *The way in which Socrates came to the knowledge
of the true God.*

When Socrates perceived how little the study of nature, after the manner of the philosophers of his age, availed for the knowledge of the true cause of the universe, he put away their unprofitable investigation of causes, and subtile and empty questionings concerning the intimate nature and elements of things;* and from the observation of the facts of nature, and from the contemplation of the wonderful wisdom and constant order every where conspicuous in the universe, combined with a most accurate study of the minds of men, he sought to know the Author of all things, his nature and perfections. This way, which alone could lead the weak intellect of man to truth, he followed to most happy issues. How skilfully he followed it and what knowledge of his objects he attained, we are now to show.

§ 8. *That God is an intelligent Being.*

And first, Socrates firmly believed, and eloquently taught, that *God is an intelligent being, rational and wise, a most excellent intelligence, the governor of the world, and the parent of the human race.* This faith and doctrine, we learn, were established on reasonings such as these. I perceive, he says, in myself an intelligent nature, which we call mind and soul. I perceive, when I do any thing in reference to a certain end, that I do it for no necessity, or chance, but from a certain intimate energy of my mind, which in its thought has foreseen this end, and controls and directs the actions by which I endeavor to attain it.† Hence when I perceive other men resembling myself in form, and manner of living and acting, I understand that their actions also which have respect to some end, in like manner proceed from an intelligent nature, which dwells in their bodies and governs them. When therefore I see an excellent

* Plato in *Phaedone*, p. 220 seqq. Tom. I. Ed. Bip. Xen. *Mem.* I. 1. 11 seqq.

† *Mem.* I. 4. 8 seqq.

poem, or a picture, or a statue, or any other work of art, skilfully wrought, I affirm that they are not the work of chance; nay, I cannot but believe that they are the workmanship of some artist, whose intelligence, manifesting itself in this, his work, I wonder at and admire. And the more eminent the skill of which any work bears the marks, the more apt the consent of all the parts to some excellent design, so much the greater I hold to be the intelligence of the artist. If, therefore, in the contemplation of the world and its parts, there is found a conspiring and convergence of an infinite number of things, of the most diverse kinds, to the accomplishment of most noble results, a plan and ordering of events and circumstances, so many, that should the wisest of mortals wish to ascertain them, an endless series of ages could find no limit to his inquiries; does not right reason compel us to acknowledge that the world also sprung* from the power and will and wisdom of some mind, and that too a most eminent and excellent mind, and that these immense bodies, arranged throughout the universe, move and maintain their order,† under the guidance of a most wise governor. The mere consideration of the nature of man makes it evident that there are ends aimed at in the constitution of things, and that all things are most carefully adapted to the attainment of them. In some particulars, at least, the observation of every one may suffice. How admirable is the structure and disposition of those organs, through which we gain a knowledge of surrounding things! How remarkably all the parts of every organ coöperate to effect that which we see to be effected by them! Thus, the eye is made most fit for seeing, the ear for hearing, the tongue for discerning the savors of substances introduced into the mouth. Who would not acknowledge it to be the result of intelligence, that the eyes, on account of their weakness, are furnished with lids, like doors, which are opened when there is need of seeing, and closed in sleep? Still further, when we see that lashes are provided for them, that they be not injured by the winds, and brows placed above, that the sweat flowing from the forehead may do no harm; when we consider the structure of the ears which are open to every sound, yet are never filled; the formation of the teeth, some of which are suited to cutting and others to chewing the food; the position of the mouth, through which the food is received, in

* I. 4. 2 seqq.

† I 4. 8.

the neighborhood of the nostrils and the eyes ; when we regard the natural desire of offspring, the innate love of parents for their children, the strong desire for their prolonged life, and the great horror and aversion they entertain for the loss of them ; can we doubt that some being endued with intelligence and wisdom, has made man ? * Reason forbids ; and the very nature of things compels us to confess that all this universe exists by the power of some intelligence. The consideration of our own being, may also in another way, persuade us, that besides our own mind, there is, far higher than man, another mind, which ought to be judged the fountain, as it were, of human souls. For as those particles of earth, of fire, of water, the harmonious combination of which is our body, are separated from that vast mass of matter that lies without and around us in nature ; so we ought not to imagine that the soul only, by some chance, we know not how, became united with the body, no other soul existing but that of man, but rather to believe, from the analogy, that there is likewise besides our own, some infinite mind, from which, as from a fountain, the minds which inhabit these bodies are separated and derived. †

§ 9. *God is omnipotent.*

If, from a work, the power of the workman is proportionably known, the contemplation of this world most clearly shows, that we ought to ascribe, not power only to God, but the highest, even infinite power. For how vast and numberless the bodies scattered over the boundless universe ! They ever move onward in wonderful order, and with a swiftness which works no harm, and yet exceeds our thought. They serve perpetual uses, yet suffer no loss and no injury. They know nothing of disease or of corruption, they never wear out or decay. All is good, supremely good ! ‡

§ 10. *The goodness, wisdom, and providence of God.*

From the whole structure of the world and the distribution of its parts, it is apparent that in the creative plan of the Deity, he regarded, as an end, the safety, convenience, and happiness

* I. 4. 4. Add what is said just below of the wisdom and providence of God.

† I. 4. 8.

‡ IV. 3, 13.

of animated beings, and chiefly of rational man ; and that he has attained this end by the wisest and fittest means. We are constrained, therefore, to regard God as a *good* and *wise* being. Never has he deserted the work which he has projected and begun, but by increasing power he preserves the course of nature unchanged, and never for a moment ceases to embrace the whole circle of his creation in his wise, benignant, and careful providence. Especially does he exercise a notable and continued care over all beings endued with life and sense, and most of all over man, for whose use chiefly, has he prepared all things, that nothing may be lacking, which might minister to his necessities or satisfaction. He has provided light, without which, although we had eyes, we should be blind. He has given us night to meet our necessity of rest, and fitted it for our comfortable repose. The sun by his light discloses to us the aspect of all things, and by his unvarying course, measures for us, the hours of the day. The uncertain darkness of night is sufficiently relieved by the stars. Further, since the life of man cannot be sustained without food, numberless varieties of fruits spring from the earth, in different seasons, and not those only which we need for the support of life, but those which delight the sense. Ample and abundant witnesses of a forecasting wisdom, are the abundance of water, the use of fire, the well ordered changes of the stars, and chiefly of the sun, which when it has finished its southward course, returns again to us, that some products of the earth may be ripened, and that others, whose season has passed, may be dried up and withered by its nearer heat ; and these changes are regularly so arranged, that this beneficent planet never can approach so near as to burn us by its intense ardor, nor recede so far as to freeze us by the cold of its distance, while at the same time, they fill the earth with the richest blessings for its inhabitants. This also is most wisely ordained, that neither winter's frost nor midsummer's heat comes upon us suddenly and at once, but so that we experience a gradual increase of each for a long time before their greatest severity.*

§ 11. *The goodness of God to all men.*

The conveniences thus far considered, are mostly, common to man with the other animals. But man excels the brutes in

* IV. 3. 3 seqq.

most particulars. He tames and domesticates them, feeds upon their milk and flesh, subjects those much stronger than himself, and compels them in many ways to serve his convenience. While, moreover, God has made other animals prone to the earth, that they may eat, he has given man an upright form and gait, a wider and upward vision, and freer and more certain motion. On other animals thus prone, feet only have been bestowed to serve their needful change of place; man has also hands, ready and swift ministers to his necessity and safety.* All animals have tongues, man only can form articulate sounds, by means of which we disclose to each other the feelings of our hearts, and communicate whatever of good we have found, enact laws, and administer commonwealths. The gift of speech is the source of our social life.†

Nay further, continues Socrates, God has not only cared for our body, but has given us a most excellent mind, god-like, and a partaker of his nature.‡ For what soul of any other animated being, has the perception of the gods, who have so wondrously fashioned all things beautiful and great? What other worships the gods? What other has such power as man, to anticipate and provide for hunger and thirst, to ward off cold and heat, to cure disease, to acquire knowledge, and retain in memory things seen and heard? Who does not see that men are as gods, among other animals, far excelling them in nature, in body and soul? For, we have a form of body well suited to our peculiar soul. What could human reason, shut up in the body of a bull? or what would be the use of hands without reason?

In what height of dignity Socrates placed the human soul, which, he affirmed, has a certain fellowship with God, may be clearly seen from what we have already said. Hence the burning zeal, with which he urged his friends to obey the inscription on the temple at Delphi, and attain the knowledge of themselves, their own nature, their own excellencies and defects, § studiously to practise and perfect their powers of mind, || to love virtue, and avoid every meanness and base desire which waste and defile the soul. ¶

* IV. 3. 10. I. 4. 11.

† IV. 3. 11 seqq. I. 4. 14.

‡ " 4. 8. IV. 3. 14.

§ III. 7. 9. IV. 2. 24.

|| I. 6. 16 seqq. III. 9. 1 seqq. IV. 1. 2 seqq.

¶ 3. 6 seqq. I. 5. II. 1 et alibi.

And since our philosopher so clearly saw and so eloquently asserted the truth concerning God, and the soul, and virtue, who can doubt that he also foresaw the immortality that shall follow our present being? Xenophon indeed in his *Memorabilia* does not explicitly treat of this point;* but in the *Cyropaedia*,† in which he seems to have wished to express the idea of a good prince, after the teachings of his own master, he introduces Cyrus, on his death bed, discoursing, plainly in the manner of Socrates, on the immortality of the soul; so that we have the highest probability that nearly all that discourse originated in the instructions of Socrates. The passages are well known in Plato, who indeed has intermingled many of his own speculations, in which Socrates has discussed this topic nobly and at large.‡

§ 12. *God's peculiar care of individuals; also of divination and the genius, so called, of Socrates.*

Socrates believed not only that God cares for the whole race of men in general, but, that in a peculiar manner he regards the interest of every individual. For though man by the strength of his intellect embraces the knowledge of many things, and can in many circumstances be guided by his own wisdom, yet it often happens that he cannot of himself determine what course of conduct he ought to follow, plainly because he cannot see the end, from the beginning. § In such doubtful cases, God has vouchsafed to intimate, by various signs, (the science of which, is called divination,||) what scheme shall lead to the best issues. Most of all, does he regard the safety of good men, if they, in affairs for which their own reason is insufficient, have recourse to him, and by fervent prayer, and fit worship,

* This question did not perhaps appear to Xenophon of such consequence, that he must dwell largely upon it, since the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was a common one among the Greeks. Yet when in these same *Memorabilia*, (chap 8. Lib. IV.) we read with how confident and cheerful a mind he spoke of his coming dissolution, and how much firmness he manifested in immediate expectation of it, we cannot avoid the conviction, that he too believed in the continued existence of the soul after this life.

† Lib. VIII. c. 7.

‡ Compare Meiners *Geschichte der Wissenschaften*, Vol. II. p. 408 seqq. § Xen. *Mem.* I. 1. 7 seqq. || IV. 7. 10.

seek his favor, never shall they be turned away uninstructed. With cheerful hope, may they expect all good from him, who alone knoweth the event of all things.* Socrates seems to have supposed that men may partake of the divine wisdom, in a twofold manner; by signs internal, and external. To the internal he seems to have referred that wisdom, which God himself directly, and by no outward means, imparts to the pious man, as it were by inspiration, if in his hour of doubt he trustfully seeks after the wisdom of God.† Hence Socrates was used to say that *God himself was his counsellor and monitor*. Which I do not think to be received as it commonly is, as if he affirmed that some tutelary deity, some guardian genius had been specially assigned to him, in preference to other men; at least, no one would readily derive such an opinion from the works of Xenophon. For if we read the passage in his first book, cap. 1. § 2 seqq., in which, he particularly treats of this subject,‡ and compare with it other passages respecting divination, we shall gather no more than this, that Socrates affirmed, that the same God whom he adored as the governor of the universe and parent of the human race, indicated what, in obscure cases, should be done, to himself and to all who earnestly worship him. § At the same time we shall see from the same pas-

* I. 1. 9. I. 4. 18. IV. 3. 12. cf. IV. 8 and below § 18. on inward worship.

† We ought the less to wonder that Socrates entertained this opinion, since he was accustomed to speak of these same endowments of mind, as eminent gifts, which are to be ascribed to the singular benignity of the Deity.—Mem. I. 1. 9. cf. I. 4. 13.

‡ “Every body knows,” says Xenophon, “that Socrates used divination. For in every man’s mouth is his assertion that the Deity foreshowed to him the future. And on this ground mainly, it seems to me, he was capitally accused, as one who had introduced new gods. But in this he introduced no new gods. For whatever men believe, there is such a thing as divination; they avail themselves of birds, oracles, prodigies, and sacrifices, to learn the future from them. Now these men believe, not that the birds themselves, or the men whom we accidentally meet, know what may be for the profit of those who seek direction from the gods, but that the gods by these tokens forewarn us; yet most men are used to say, speaking in common phrase, that they are persuaded or dissuaded by these birds and by these prodigies. But Socrates, suiting his language strictly to the judgment of his mind, used to say that God himself forewarned and admonished him.”

§ The following are the principal passages of Xenophon, which es-

sages, that his adversaries, even then, misled by their envy of him, misinterpreted his opinions. Under external signs, are to be included the more common kinds of divination, auguries, prodigies, sacrifices, and oracles, which Socrates seems not altogether to have despised,* perhaps because he conceived them to have an efficacy somewhat like that of lots, by aid of which, in doubtful cases, God may foreshow to men, what ought to be done, or what shall be the event.† But although God wishes us in doubtful cases, thus to take counsel of himself, this favor of divination is by no means to be abused. They are insane, and guilty of a wrong, Socrates was used to say, who, through sloth or superstition, neglect to use their own reason, and seek, by divination, to explain those things which God has given

to establish the opinion, that Socrates ascribed his own foresight (*μαντιχήν*) not to any genius peculiar to himself, but to the supreme Deity. First the discussion, Lib. I. cap. 1. § 2 seq. where Xenophon, professedly treating of the prophetic power (*μαντιχή*) of Socrates, uses promiscuously the words *θεός*, *θεοί*, *το δαιμόνιον*, which elsewhere are in the same manner applied to the Deity. Then, Lib. I. 4. 19. where Socrates plainly attributes to the gods (*τοῖς θεοῖς*) the grounds of the practice of divination (*τὸ σημαίνειν περὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πάντων*). And likewise Lib. I. 4. 18. to the Divinity (*τῷ θεῷ*). Nay, in I. 1. 9. and IV. 3. 12 seq. (comp. I. 4. 18.) he plainly says that God indicates the future, not to himself only, but to every man, who, by sincere piety, seeks to gain his favor. Finally, in Lib. I. 3. 4. we find the declaration, *εἰ δὲ τι δόξαιεν αὐτῷ σημαίνεσθαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν*, etc. From which I think it abundantly evident that Socrates did by no means affirm that intimations of the future were made to him, by some peculiar genius. Conf. IV. 3. 12., 8. 5. seq. 11.

* Mem. I. 1. 6. I. 4. 15.

† Whether Socrates made so much of oracles as has seemed to some learned men, may, I think, be doubted. I have not sufficient evidence of it, nor can it be supposed that the frauds and artifices of the priesthood could have been utterly a secret from Socrates. The meaning of the advice which he gave Xenophon, when he deliberated whether he should join Cyrus in Asia, that he should consult the Delphic Apollo on the subject of his meditated excursion, Xenophon himself satisfactorily declares, in his Expedition of Cyrus near the beginning of the third book, where he expressly treats of this matter. The sum of that statement is that Socrates in his own private judgment approved the scheme of Xenophon, but feared lest it might bring upon him the odium of his fellow citizens; and to avoid this odium, he judged it prudent for Xenophon to strengthen himself by the authority of the oracle, in a favorable reply.

man to ascertain and understand, by the use of his own rational powers, and with the aids of human experience and industry. Not less insane, he affirmed them to be, who will never apply for guidance to the divine wisdom, and esteem their own reason competent to every emergency. Those who would avoid alike superstition and a disregard of any expression of the divine will, he counselled earnestly to cultivate those gifts of intellect which God has bestowed upon men, and strenuously to avail themselves of all the resources of human skill, that, in their need, they may plan wisely ; and in circumstances, in which human skill and means of knowledge fail, when they cannot well trust their own judgment, or the suggestions of other men, they must have recourse to the wisdom of God as revealed by divination.*

§ 13. *God is everywhere, and knows all things.*

As Socrates supposed God to care and provide for all things, and always to consult for the interests of men, it were but consistent for him to conceive the same being to be present everywhere, and to see and know all things. We are conscious, he says,† that our mind is present to our whole body, and governs it according to its will ; we ought in like manner to believe that the wisdom, which presides over the universe, is present to the whole world, and orders all things after its own pleasure. It is not to be imagined that our eyes can discern objects at the distance of many stadia, and that the eye of God cannot see all things ; it is not to be imagined that our minds can be occupied with what is transacted in our neighborhood, in Sicily and in Egypt, and that the divine mind cannot be intent at the same time upon all things. If indeed, in such manner as by acts of friendship, we ascertain who are willing to be our friends ; and by conferring favors, who are grateful ; and by asking advice, who are prudent ; we are willing by worshipping God, to ascertain if he will impart his wisdom to us in our doubts ; then clearly shall we perceive that the divine nature is such and so great, that it sees at once all things, and hears all things, is everywhere, perceives the inmost thoughts and purposes of our hearts, and exercises a watchful care over all things.‡

§ 14. *God is invisible.*

But some one will say, we do not see the creator and gov-

* *Mem.* I. I. 6 seqq. † I. 4. 17 seqq. ‡ *Loc. cit.* and I. I. 19.

ernor of the world, as we see the authors of human works. We are not to wait, Socrates would reply, till we can behold the form of God; the contemplation of his works should constrain us to worship and adore him. Yet neither do we see with our eyes, our own mind, even, which of all things we know is most intimately allied to the divine nature; only from its effects we perceive it to be lord of the body.* We may not rashly look upon the sun, from which we enjoy the highest benefits, nor are the winds and other ministers of the gods, whose effects we see, perceived by our eyes. So also the power of the Divinity, although itself escapes our senses, is to be learned from the mighty works, which we see daily accomplished by it.†

§ 15. God is one.

In reading Xenophon we notice that Socrates speaks sometimes of God, in the singular number, sometimes of Gods, in the plural, and seems on this subject to be wavering and in the greatest uncertainty.‡ Whether he conjectured, that there are many deities of an inferior order; or thought § the God-head, (τὸ δαιμόνιον) in respect of various attributes, might be called Gods, (τοὺς θεούς) in the plural, as, for example, that one and the same God might be worshipped under the name of Jupiter, as the father and preserver of the human race, and under the name of Neptune, as the ruler of the seas; or whether he thus spoke in accommodation to the common opinion and language of his countrymen, and that he might secure a more ready hearing for doctrines remote from their ordinary apprehension and habit of thought, this at least is clear beyond doubt, as well from the entire scope and method of every discussion, in which Socrates professedly treats of the Divinity, as from the various names, or rather descriptions by which he designates Him,||

* I. 4. 9. IV. 3. 14. † IV. 3. 13 seq.

‡ Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*. I. 12.

§ So IV. 3. 13. the other gods (οἱ ἄλλοι θεοὶ) seem to be contrasted with the supreme Deity; yet whom he means by the other gods is somewhat in doubt.

|| The names are chiefly these, ὁ θεός I. 4. 13. 17. etc. τὸ θεῖον I. 4. 18. τὸ δαιμόνιον I. 1. 2. seq. IV. 3. 13. seq. etc. ὁ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ποιῶν ἀνθρώπους I. 4. 5. σοφὸς δημιουργὸς I. 4. 7. ἡ ἐν παντὶ φρόνησις I. 4. 17. ὁ τὸν ὅλον κόσμον συντάττων, καὶ συνέχων καὶ αἰὲν χρωμένοις ἀτρίβῃ τε καὶ ὑγιᾷ καὶ ἀγήρατον παρέχων, τὰ μέγιστα πράττων καὶ οἰονομῶν. IV. 3. 13.

that he believed that there is *one only God*, the creator, preserver, and governor of the world, and that God is, in the highest sense, powerful, good, wise, benevolent to men, knowing all things, provident for all things, omnipresent.

CHAP. III.

OF THE WORSHIP OF GOD.

§ 16. *The necessity and utility of divine worship.*

Socrates has assigned various reasons why the Deity should be worshipped by men. And first, because, though he is so far above us, he yet thinks us worthy of his interest in our wants, and regard for our happiness.* Again, because by the worship of him, we may best learn his goodness, love, providence, and good will to us.† Still more, because there is an instinctive tendency to adoration of the gods. For whence those fierce stings of conscience, which night and day goad and torment them who have done wrong? Whence that lofty calmness of a mind conscious of its innocence and goodness, if there is not in men an innate sentiment of the being of a God, who can reward and punish them, whose laws they ought to obey, whose person they are bound to reverence? Nor ought that opinion to be taken as resting on slight grounds, or as conceived under any illusion, which has ever prevailed in the public institutions of all nations, and has been the intimate conviction of the best and wisest men.‡ Truly this is a divine law, written by God himself on the soul of man—**WORSHIP GOD**—which law whoever despises, him a punishment that cannot be escaped, shall necessarily follow. No one can with impunity break the divine laws, for from the very act, in which they are contemned, the punishment arises, by natural consequence.§ Thus from the divine laws to the human, has been transferred this ordinance concerning the worship of the gods; not from any evil design, but because it has been made clear that the State, which is not restrained by

* I. 4. 10.

† I. 4. 18.

‡ I. 4. 16. IV. 3. 16.

§ IV. 4. 19 seq. This passage contains a remarkable discussion of the natural laws engraven by the Deity on our souls.

reverence for the Deity, must be disturbed and harassed by perpetual wars, seditions, deceits, wrongs, fierceness, and other evils most pernicious to the social life of men, or by the severest penalties connected with the disregard of the laws of civil union.*

§ 17. *The outward worship of God.*

So far as pertains to the outward worship of Deity, Socrates, both in words and acts, followed the law of the State, and exhorted others to do the same.† He offered sacrifices after the manner of his fathers on the altars, public and private, and paid his vows to the gods in the temples of the city. (cf. § 15.) For he judged them to be engaged in affairs out of their sphere, and to have undertaken a useless and unnecessary labor,‡ who wish to change by personal influence, the forms of religion which have been consecrated by the authority of the State. Socrates therefore mainly endeavored to make common a purer idea of God; conceiving that this would put to flight other abuses, which are sustained by formal rites alone. But in making sacrifices he strongly commended the precept of Hesiod, καὶ δύνανται ἔρδειν ἱερὸν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι. For God is not persuaded as men are, by splendid gifts, and magnificent tokens of respect, but is best pleased with the reverence of the pious. Hence Socrates believed that the scanty offerings of the poor are not less acceptable to God than the costly and noble sacrifices of the rich. If it were not so, he must often prefer the offerings of the evil to those of the good. But life were not desirable, if the Deity were better pleased with the sacrifice of a wicked man, because it is rich, than of a good man, which might be of slight value.§

§ 18. *The inward worship of God.*

From what has been said, it is sufficiently evident that Socrates judged the true worship of God to consist not in actions of outward splendor, but in the feelings of the heart toward him,

* Cf. Cic. *de Legg.* II.7.

† Xen. *Mem.* I. 3. 1. Conf. Cicero *de Legg.* II. 7.

‡ This I think is the force of the words *περιεργους καὶ ματαλους*, which Xenophon used in the passage just cited, nor do I see why, as is commonly done, *περιεργους* should be translated *superstitious*.

§ *Mem.* I. 3. 3.

and in a sincere love of virtue. He who would be accepted of God, ought, he says, above all, to express to him the feelings of a grateful heart. Although no man can render a gratitude adequate to his kindness, yet we can attain the favor of God, if with constant and unremitting effort (which is the force of Hesiod's *καὶ δὲ νύκτιν*) we strive to conform every action of our life to his will, to commend ourselves alway to his judgment, and desire in all the strength and sincerity of our souls to please and obey him.* If we hold resolutely to such a plan of life, and approve ourselves to God by such worship and obedience, we ought to repose in him the highest trust, and not only to seek from him all good things by prayer, but to expect them also with firm faith. In framing our prayers, he specially enjoined that we should not decide what things are good and desirable from our own erring judgment, and as it were prescribe by name what we desire to obtain; but that, simply and in general terms, we should ask of God, such things as are truly good and salutary, and firmly persuade ourselves that he best knows what will be for our interest, and from his own wisdom and benignity, will bestow such things in a manner far better than according to our feeble and imperfect choice.†

* IV. 3. 15 seq. III. 9. 15. IV. 6. 2 seq. Socrates not only taught this by his precepts, but approved them by his example. Thus when once he was a senator, and the whole people wished unjustly to condemn nine magistrates to death, Socrates who at the time presided in the assembly, refused to put the question to a vote, though the people were exceedingly indignant, and himself was threatened by the more powerful citizens; preferring the sanctity of his oath to the favor of the people and his personal safety. *Mem.* I. 1. 18. This also is an eminent proof of his piety, that when he thought he had received any token of the Divine will, he would no more allow himself to be persuaded to act contrary to that declared will, than he would be persuaded to choose a blind and ignorant guide in place of one clear-sighted and well acquainted with his route. He also severely censured the madness of others, who that they may avoid the reproof or ridicule of men, dare to disobey the known and published will of God. So far even did he reverence the will of God above all things else, that he was ready to suffer death, when he had judged Him to have decreed it, reckoning that he can turn to our advantage what seems to us the greatest evil. *Mem.* I. 3. 4. IV. cap. 8. throughout.

† IV. 3. 17. I. 3. 2. Evidently suited to the genius of Socrates, and concurring with the testimony of Xenophon, is the discussion of Socrates concerning divine worship and prayers, in the second Alci-

Conclusion.

This is nearly all that Xenophon has delivered to us of the doctrine of Socrates respecting God and his worship. Of this doctrine different men have formed widely different judgments. Some have dared to equal and even to prefer Socrates to the holy founder of our religion and his apostles ; at whose vain attempts we may well wonder. For though he has taught many things excellent, noble, and true ; yet not only are the same things found again and again in the sacred writings, but placed in clearer light, and accompanied by many other truths, more closely connected with the true happiness of man, of which no traces are to be found in Socrates. Others, on the contrary, have endeavored to depreciate the well deserved fame of Socrates ; partly through ignorance ; partly excited by the rash boldness of those who have dared, through undue admiration of Socrates, to undervalue divinely revealed truth ; partly without regard to the different circumstances of different ages, judging Socrates as a christian philosopher, and demanding more than is reasonable of him. Hence they are accustomed harshly to censure many things in him, which are not sustained by sufficient evidence of their truth, or which ought not to be severely blamed, when the age and manners among which he lived are considered, though in our times and with our better light and christian knowledge, they would merit strong terms of reprehension. But plainly, Socrates is not to be regarded as a man entirely free from the ordinary failings of humanity ; nor as a teacher who can be expected to purify the discipline of morals and the doctrine of divine things from every stain and error, and lead men to that height of knowledge and moral safety, to which God himself has opened to us the way in Christ ; but as one, who, under the guidance of sound reason, desired to attain, as far as the weakness of human nature, the state of his age, and the envy of his fellow citizens would allow, to the understanding of the true God and of virtue, and thus to a life of happiness, and who wished to bring others to the same end, by mild

biades of Plato, which may well be compared. And the supposition is not without plausibility which has before been maintained by some (Athenaeus Lib. XI. p. 506. c.) that the dialogue, which is entitled *Alcibiades Minor*, was written not by Plato, but by Xenophon.

counsels and persuasions.* That the efforts of this most excellent man were not without effect, we may easily learn from the consideration of his life and teachings ; and, after the most exact scrutiny and judgment, we cannot but call him the prince of the philosophers of antiquity, and assign him a place in that rank of good men, whose memory is ever precious.

ARTICLE IV.

THE WEAPONS OF UNIVERSALISM REVERSED.

By Rev. Edwin Helt, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

UNIVERSALISM, in its mutations, has reached a form that conflicts with not a few of the most obvious principles of inspired truth. Its march of improvement illustrates the tendency of a favorite hypothesis to blind the eye to contradictions of the most glaring character, in a doating pursuit of one engrossing end. It professes to teach a system of duty, and yet saps the foundation of all responsibility by making human conduct the result of unavoidable circumstances. It professes to prepare men for the heavenly world, and yet acknowledges no connection between the doings of this life and the retributions of eternity. It professes to give the most exalted conceptions of the Deity, and yet on some essential points it degrades, more than any

* It was ever the highest care of Socrates, to inform his friends with the true idea of God and of his relation to men, that not in the light only and in the presence of men, but in solitude, often the mother and the nurse of the worst counsels and vices, they might be restrained from all malice, meanness, injustice, and impiety. *Mem.* I. 4. 19. IV. 3. 2. The doctrine of Socrates would have made much greater progress, had it not been resisted partly by the common superstition which could not be attacked without danger, and which threatened him with a prison and with death, and partly by the influence of the Sophists, who sustained by their authority the sentiments of the multitude. (Cf. IV.) For who does not prefer to be learned, to being a learner? (Cf. Plato, *de Repub.* Lib. VI. Tom. VII. p. 87. seq.) To Socrates may well be applied the words of the same writer in the *Timaeus*, τὸν μὲν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντός εὐρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λίγυν.

other system, the divine character. It uses with great freedom its own form of reasoning to demolish the system of evangelical faith, but seems not to be aware that its own weapons may be turned with success against its own citadel. We are not sure that the friends of truth have observed how easily and how completely the heavy ordnance of universalism may be turned against itself.

It is proposed to show, in reference to the leading features of the divine character, that the arguments with which universalism attacks our sentiments, may be retorted upon itself with decided success. If these arguments work for the system, they work equally well against it.

I. Universalism brings against God the odious charge of partiality.

It denies the doctrine of a future judgment. It teaches that our future state is not affected by the doings of this life. It asserts that all men are punished according to their deserts in this world. It restricts the punishment of sin to the various misfortunes of life, the reproaches of conscience, and the pangs of death. The system that pronounces these evils to be the only penal results of sin, cannot vindicate itself from the charge of glaring partiality. The following specifications of this charge may be enumerated.

1. According to this system, the punishment of death, which is the worst form of punishment, is inflicted upon all, how various soever may be their grades of guilt.

Justice would dictate that, if death were the highest penalty of the divine law, it should not be inflicted on all with indiscriminate severity. No criminal code of human origin awards capital punishment to every offender—from the traitor that would enslave his country, down to the smuggler that evades the payment of a trivial duty; from the blood-stained pirate, down to the dissipated youth who disturbs the peace by a midnight revel. Such levelling severity would be deemed the grossest injustice. With such severity, however, do universalists brand the government of the blessed God. The infant that has never lisped a syllable sinks under the agonies of death. The child, whose sins have not risen to the size and enormity of the sins of manhood, is punished also with death. Those who have advanced to the meridian of life, disclosing to the eye of God additional guilt at every step—are punished with but the same severity. And the aged offender, who has grown

gray in sin, whom neither mercies nor misfortunes can reclaim, who devotes the venerable influence of advanced life to the corruption of the young, suffers nothing worse than death. Is there then no difference between the faint dawn of sinfulness, and the vivid brightness of mature iniquity? between the tender blossom and the mellow fruit of sin? between the hesitating air, the uneffaced blush of childish guilt, and the insolent port and vaunting air of experienced wickedness?

It is true that in some instances the agonies of death are comparatively light. Sometimes, indeed, they are but momentary. But this mitigation of punishment, granted, as it often is, with no regard to justice, is only a confirmation of the charge of partiality. The meek and patient Christian, whose life has been a public blessing, often experiences a more direful and prolonged conflict with the king of terrors, than the most worthless votary of vice. Even the child who has scarcely begun to walk in the path of sin, is convulsed on a death bed with throes which lacerate the parents' heart, while the vilest miscreant, by public execution or by suicide, is hurried into eternity almost without a struggle. Would not this be partiality of the most glaring description, if universalism were true? Is the heaviest penalty recognised by this system thus enforced with no just regard to age or character? What could be more glaring injustice?

2. According to the system of universalism a similar specification of the charge of partiality against the Most High is to be seen in the infliction of the punishment of remorse. The stings of conscience are pronounced by the friends of universalism an important part of the retribution to which men are condemned in this world. The compunctions of remorse are inflicted on men with no just reference to character.

Behold the gay libertine, who scruples not to destroy the peace of virtuous families, who glories in deeds that plunge the victims of his ensnaring arts into the lowest depths of degradation, who moves in society like a pestilential sirocco, spreading around him a polluting influence; leaving the imprint of vice and infamy wherever he treads. Observe the gay indifference with which he proceeds in his pathway of crime. Does he feel the agonies of remorse? Question him upon the subject and he will smile in scorn at your simplicity. His moral sensibilities have been long benumbed. Remorse is a stranger to his bosom. He has reached such a proficiency in wickedness,

that he can proceed from crime to crime with unruffled composure. Nay, he plumes himself upon the skill with which he makes havoc of the morals and the happiness of his deluded victims.

Turn next to an humble Christian whose life is stained by no immorality. For a season he is overwhelmed with sorrow. What has led to the distress you witness? What cause has covered his face with sadness? What secret agony preys upon his soul? The cause of his grief is one which he would rather conceal within the sanctuary of his bosom than drag out to public observation. He has detected within himself a diminished interest in the word of God, the fervor of his prayers may have given place to cold formality. The business or the fascinations of the world may have engrossed his attention unduly, or he has felt the workings of an unsubdued spirit of resentment. The cause which seems to his watchful piety so loudly to demand tears of contrition has not been discovered by his bosom friends. And while to the observer's view his life presents the charm of christian consistency, he weeps and mourns before God over the secret offences of his inward life. Nor does he wear the aspect of peace and gladness till the assurance of pardon and favor from his God has relieved his heavy heart. In one hour does he experience more distress than the conscience of the hardened libertine would inflict in an entire year. Is then the humble Christian, who mortifies every sinful desire, more guilty than the bold transgressor who gives a loose rein to his worst passions? If not, why does he endure the compunctions of remorse in such a disproportionate degree? If men are punished only in this life, and if, as is alleged, remorse is a fearful part of the sinner's punishment, why are the compunctions of the vicious so trivial as to be no availing obstruction of their pleasures or their crimes, while the conscientious Christian quivers with apprehension, upon the neglect of the slightest duty? Here is a strange disregard of justice which universalism does not explain.

3. The partiality of the Ruler of the world is evinced also, according to universalism, in the happy removal of the wicked from earth to heaven, while righteous survivors are still subjected to many sorrows.

The more profligate a man becomes, the more does he shorten his life. According to an inspired proverb, the wicked do not live out half their days. They die and are borne to heaven, if universalism may be credited. Having finished their course

with joy, having run a race of glaring iniquity, having contended not against the enemies of the soul, but against the cause of holiness and the servants of God to the last moment, having won the crown of public infamy, having become meet for an inheritance with the devil and his angels, they are ushered by the ministering spirits to the abodes of the blessed. The glories of heaven beam around them; the bliss of heaven fills their bosoms; the Holy One lavishes upon them the warmest commendations. But where are the miserable survivors, the devout men whose peace they loved to disturb, whose piety they loved to deride, whose beneficent plans they loved to embarrass? They are doomed to remain in this vale of tears, to breast additional opposition from the replenished ranks of the enemies of godliness. They must weep and struggle for many a tedious year before the time of their release shall come. They may yet outlive another annoying generation of the ungodly before they can be discharged from their earthly imprisonment.

Thus the antediluvians were hurried from a life of insufferable wickedness to a heavenly home; and as they looked down from heaven, with what feelings did they observe the faithful Noah as he pursued his lonely voyage over a buried world? With what emotions did they witness his subsequent misfortunes? They could thank God that they were now safe and happy in heaven, while the inmates of the ark were doomed to spend on earth additional years of perplexity and sorrow. Is this justice?

According to universalism, God shortened the lives of the men of Sodom and removed them prematurely, or rather by a fortunate providence, to the abodes of the blessed. At the same time he prolonged the existence of the faithful Lot under the most painful circumstances. The unhappy man survived the destruction, or rather the salvation of his daughters, the mournful, or rather happy end of his wavering wife, the loss of his property and the ruin of his town. Was it an equitable procedure to transfer the vile inmates of that polluted city from earth to heaven, while the aged Lot was left to roam in desolation and grief, a wanderer on earth?

Was it just to doom the favored Israelites to a prolonged life amid the burning sands of the desert, while their pursuers, the Egyptian host, were relieved from the work of malignant persecution and transferred to heaven? In a few minutes the latter were drowned, and then their happiness was complete—for forty years the Israelites bore the sufferings of a sojourn in the desert.

Let a man serve God with pious care, and in ordinary circumstances, he will outlive the abandoned voluptuary. His piety will be rewarded by a long exclusion from the joys of heaven. He must stay on earth till he has seen his fondest hopes crushed a hundred times; he must endure separations that will wring his heart; he must live till he becomes an incumbrance to his friends, till he stands a solitary trunk, stripped of its branches, bowing and trembling under every blast; he must endure neglect; he must witness the unconcealed avidity of eager heirs to gain possession of his property; perhaps he outlives his reason and remains a helpless wreck, and his dotage exhausts the patience of all around him. At last death removes the superannuated burden from the world.

Let a profligate young man rush into vicious excesses. In a fit of inebriation, or in the hope of concealing crime he commits a murder; the laws of the land doom him to die. Or in other words, a kind providence thus favors him with a speedier discharge from the woes of earth. Instead of dragging out a long life, he is borne to heaven, ere he has attained mature age. He is blessed with an earlier release from the perils and vicissitudes of earth than the pious man. But where is the equity of this procedure? In all such instances, universalism charges the Almighty with a flagrant disregard of justice.

We do not affirm that the righteous always outlive the wicked, but if they do, the fact furnishes ground for the charge of partiality, upon the principles of universalism.

4. Sometimes the most holy men have been persecuted bitterly by the enemies of religion. This may be specified as an additional impeachment of the divine justice as it is expounded by universalism.

Why were the primitive Christians loaded with every indignity and subjected to every outrage? Why did the blood of martyrs flow? Why did the groans of persecuted Christians ascend from the stake "with the smoke of their torments?" It was because they were righteous, and their oppressors wicked. They were punished with death in its worst forms. The persecutors survive to enjoy the blessings of prosperity. If there be no future retribution, if the oppressor may inflict the most cruel tortures upon the servant of Christ and still enjoy the ordinary share of earthly happiness, if the martyr and the relentless monster who chained him to the stake must meet at length under the same canopy of divine favor, if the oppressed and the

oppressor, with no future adjustment of their doings before the bar of God, must stand on the same level, where is the justice of the Holy One? If retribution is dispensed only in this world, here is partiality of the most glaring description.

5. Sometimes men are removed into eternity in the very act of atrocious wickedness. According to the system of universalism this is the most palpable form of partiality in the government of the world.

• An instance of this kind has been already mentioned. The Egyptians, while pursuing the oppressed Israelites were engulfed in the Red Sea. The pirate has perished in the act of inflicting death upon peaceful men. The highwayman has been slain by the armed traveller. The adulterer has fallen a victim to the vengeance of an injured man. It is said that three robbers had been successful in seizing a rich booty. One of their number was sent to a neighboring town to obtain a supply of provisions. His companions resolved to murder him on his return, that they might secure for themselves the whole of the booty. Their cruel resolution was carried into effect. Previously to his death he had poisoned the food which he was sent to purchase—for the purpose of becoming sole proprietor of the plundered wealth. His companions suspecting no danger, partook of the provisions and died. Thus all were cut off in the very act of atrocious wickedness.

In such cases, when are the perpetrators of crime punished? Not in the future world, if we are to believe universalism; not in this life, for they die in the very commission of glaring crimes. And yet we are told that in this world men do receive according to their deserts? How is justice administered in cases of this description? When are those who die in the very commission of crime punished? or do they pass with all their guilt to the courts of heaven?

Say not that these cases are rare. Happily this is the fact. How comes it to pass that any such instances occur under the government of the all-wise God? Are not such instances so many specifications of glaring partiality?

Should the governor of the State detect but a few men in the commission of murder, or rape, or forgery—should he shield them by all the power of executive patronage from the grasp of justice—should he advance them to the highest stations of influence, the glaring injustice of the procedure would call forth the most tumultuous excitement. Universalists themselves

would reprobate such a wanton outrage upon the rights of society. And does the Holy One welcome to the embrace of his love the blood-stained murderer, who has been slain in the commission of crime, or the foul libertine who has perished by the hand of an injured man? He does, if universalism may be credited.

The view of apparent irregularities like those that have been mentioned thus far, has driven men to the belief of future retribution. They have seen that unless a future time for the adjustment of such proceedings should arrive, the divine character would labor under the most unhappy implications. They have believed, as the Bible teaches, that the time will come, when the delayed retribution will be awarded to the evil and the good, with exact impartiality. God has appointed a day of judgment in which the transactions of this life will be closely scrutinized, and when every man shall "receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Universalism, in rejecting this scriptural truth, dispenses with a doctrine which has seemed to the servants of God and to the world at large the only explanation of the apparent disregard of justice in the government of this world. The friends of this system are obliged to prove merely from what is developed in this life, that God is just. They are not at liberty to leave perplexing difficulties to be explained by the unfolding scenes of the future world. All punishment, according to their system, is inflicted in this world. The reality of a day of judgment they deny. They must either question the justice of God, or explain in some satisfactory manner the glaring instances of partiality which their system discloses in the administration of Jehovah.

Until universalism can account for the deviations from rectitude which her system brings to light in the providence of God, we must affirm that upon the principles of this system the Holy One is guilty of glaring partiality—that he is not "righteous in all his ways and holy in all his works."

II. Universalism involves a charge of incompetency against the Sovereign of the world.

The Almighty has established laws by which men are to be governed. He has affixed penalties which may be supposed the most suitable that infinite wisdom can devise. According to the scheme of universalism, the penalties are faithfully enforced; every man, it is said, "is punished to the full extent of his guilt."

How does the administration of Jehovah succeed? What is the state of the world? Does the government of the Eternal inspire sufficient awe or sufficient love to save men from incurring the penalty of the law? Where is the man that has been restrained effectually from sin? There is not an instance of undeviating rectitude in our world. All have sinned; all do sin, and all are punished. There is not one of our race who escapes the penalty of the law as it is explained by universalism.

The civil government that could not wield sufficient influence to keep any of its citizens from becoming felons, would be deemed singularly weak. If all the inhabitants of our land were, at some time of their life, the inmates of a prison, you would infer that there must be some glaring defect in the structure of the government—either that the laws are unwise, or that the execution of them fails of answering the desired purpose. Universalism would bring out to view a similar defect in the divine government. It contemplates no future day of reckoning, when the unpunished and unpardoned offences of men are to be visited with ample retribution. It makes all men suffer in this world, and only in this world, according to their desert. It contends that God enforces faithfully the penalties of his laws. Under an administration so effective, what do we witness? Every inhabitant of our world becomes a malefactor, and is punished. There is none that does not become, at some time of his life, an inmate of the universalist's hell. The great mass of the human family must be imprisoned over and over again, as long as they live. Some persons, if we may judge by their misfortunes, seem never to remain out of this prison. Why, if a civil government could not sustain itself without covering the land with prisons and immuring within their walls all its subjects, from the chief magistrates down to the humblest child, at intervals, would it not be deemed miserably weak?

According to our views, the penalty of the divine law is not enforced in this life; its full infliction is reserved for a future state; and at last an immensely large proportion, saved by the atonement, will escape the penalty of eternal death. The government of God will accomplish its benign purposes without the enforcement of threatened suffering on every mortal. It is so effective as to recover lost sinners to the love and service of a holy God. Whereas according to universalism, none escape punishment; all are fully punished in this life. Nor do they

seem to be beneficially affected by this severity. The government of Jehovah, it seems then, is too weak to save any of the race; all sin, and all are punished; and they sin and suffer punishment as long as they live, are imprisoned and then set at liberty to be imprisoned over and over again in the reputed hell of this world's misery. Thus we are taught to regard God chiefly as the jailer of the world. Though he is vigorous in the extreme in the discharge of this unpleasant office, his prisons are continually filled, and yet the earth remains the same abode of universal depravity.

Let it not be replied here that universalism teaches the final salvation of all men, and that it provides a remedy for all existing evils in the divine administration. If sin is punished only in this world, future salvation can be no remedy for the ills of our present state. The doings of this life are to have no bearing upon the future. Such is the singular admission of universalism, (*Whittemore's Notes on the Parables*, p. 354.) In forming our estimate then of the divine government, we must limit our views to its results in this life, and here, as we have seen, we witness weakness and inefficiency. The administration of the Almighty is more unsuccessful than the administration of any human ruler, if we must credit universalism.

The legislators of antiquity deemed it unwise to propose laws without enforcing their penalties by the fear of future punishment. It is the opinion of statesmen that human laws cannot be sustained without the aid of a belief in future punishment. Even Napoleon would not dispense with this aid among the means by which his government was administered. But universalism makes the Ruler of the world so unwise as to dispense entirely with the threatening of human punishment. If her statements were true, the all-wise God might improve his administration greatly if he would only learn from human sagacity to restrain mankind by the fear of future punishment.

The penalty of punishment in this life never has restrained men to any great extent. Whether it be threatened by God or by man, it is not sufficient to ameliorate essentially the character of our race. Universalists themselves show that all the hell which they suffer in this world is but an inconsiderable evil. For although confident that they shall be happy after death, they evince no eagerness to leave a world where the sins of men are rigorously punished. They like their prison. Its confinement is not intolerably irksome. They are not anxious to depart and

be with Christ, as Paul was. We have known some of their number to be extremely unwilling to die, and wish earnestly to stay longer on earth, to stay in the only place of punishment which they believe to be known in the dominions of the Almighty. Why should they wish to linger in our world, if it be a hell, and the only hell, as they assert, unless they begin to find that their doctrine is false, since it charges God with such incompetency as can never disgrace the government of the Eternal.

III. *Universalism conflicts with the benevolence of God.*

We, who believe the doctrine of future and endless punishment, are accused of dishonoring God by adopting the most revolting conceptions of his character. Especially are our views said to conflict with divine benevolence. We believe that our conceptions of divine goodness, when stripped of the hideous drapery which our opponents are pleased to hang around them, will be found to accord, not clash with the inspired assertion, "God is love." We are charged with denying the goodness of God. Those who differ from us claim at least to entertain more expanded views of the divine benevolence than we do. Are they sure that their sentiments involve no impeachment of the goodness of the Almighty? This is a point on which they express themselves with much warmth, sometimes in a strain that denotes the most sincere desire to show forth the praises of the Lord, sometimes with a hectic glow and a severity of expression that betokens more doubt than conviction of the alleged superior belief in the benignity of God.

We wish not to say in return the hard things that have been said of ourselves. Our sentiments teach us to render good for evil, blessing for reviling. We shall not then retort upon our assailants the charge that their doctrine supposes God "to delight in cruelty." But we shall attempt to show that universalism involves heavy charges against the benevolence of the Deity.

1. The first specification we would make of this charge is, that if the doctrine of eternal punishment be not true, its prevalence is irreconcilable with the alleged goodness of God, for we cannot suppose that he would suffer mankind to be deluded and afflicted as they have been by the dominion of a cruel error down to the present time.

If the heart of our Heavenly Father turns with instinctive horror from the mere conception of the future and endless pun-

ishment of an impenitent sinner—with as much more aversion than universalists feel—as he is greater and more benevolent than man—it is not a strange inference that he would not suffer his children on earth to be tormented by the fear of future punishment. His goodness certainly would not suffer him to play thus with their apprehensions. He would soon relieve a suffering world from such a horrible delusion as the doctrine in question seems to the universalist.

What is the fact? Has the doctrine of the endless punishment of unforgiven sin been disowned or favored by the Father of men? Has it been uniformly rejected by Him on whose character it is said to reflect most unhappily? And have the generations of men lived in happy ignorance of this cruel delusion? And was it reserved for some vile misanthrope to broach the false and pernicious sentiment as late as our own century? The doctrine of the eternal condemnation of the impenitent sinner has been more or less distinctly believed in every age of the world. Examine the tenets of the principal systems of religion that have prevailed among men, and you find a distinct avowal of belief in future punishment; in some, of endless punishment. Examine the dictates of conscience and the natural apprehensions of men. Do they declare that no punishment awaits the sinner beyond the grave? Their unwarped verdict accords with the Bible. They teach men to expect future woe. They suggest “a fearful looking for of judgment.” It is not till men have been *schooled* out of their original impressions by patient effort that they deny the doctrine of future punishment, except perhaps, in the case of those who have been reared under the influence of erroneous belief, in whose breasts veneration for parental wishes and established prejudice may be expected to control the natural suggestions of the heart. The most of universalists have held originally the belief which they now reject. Even their testimony once concurred with the teachings of unprejudiced conscience.

Before the coming of Christ the doctrine of future and endless punishment prevailed among Jews and Pagans. This is admitted by Dr. Hartley a zealous defender of universal salvation; who believed it to be a general tradition, and who admits that it has been “the doctrine of the Christian world ever since, some very few persons excepted.” (See Dr. Hawes’s Tract on Universalism, p. 3.)

Why is it the deep seated sentiment of the mind that sin

must be punished hereafter. This conviction, as ancient as the world, whether we trace it to tradition or to the natural suggestions of the mind, comes from God. If it be a false sentiment, how can its existence and prevalence be reconciled with the alleged goodness of the Lord?

The doctrine of future and endless punishment has been most distinctly believed by those who have enjoyed the instructions of inspired prophets and teachers. The men who have been authorized by divine inspiration to teach the way of salvation, have conveyed the belief that this doctrine is founded in truth. Have prophets and apostles then taught what they were not instructed to teach? Were they commissioned to make known the doctrines of universalism, and have they taught the opposite doctrines so distinctly, that the whole christian world "some very few persons excepted," have been grievously misled? Was it incompetency, or dishonesty, that made Christ and the apostles teachers of error? Teachers of error they were in fact, if universalism be true—for their instructions have established the belief that sin will be punished forever.

Will it be said that they were incompetent teachers, that while they believed the truth of universalism, they were not able to defend and explain it to the satisfaction of their hearers, and that in spite of their most vigorous exertions the prejudices of the world remained unshaken? If the defenders of universalism assumed this position, and thus claim for their leaders more talent than fell to the lot of the Saviour and his apostles, how will they vindicate the goodness of God? Why did not a benevolent Deity raise up in former ages prophets and apostles who could teach universalism as distinctly and intelligibly as Balfour and Ballou? Why was the valuable discovery that revelation teaches universalism postponed to our own time? Why was not the first promulgation of Christianity entrusted to men who would perform their work in a less bungling manner than incompetent apostles are supposed to have done? The same benignant Providence that has blessed the world with the instructions of modern preachers of universalism, could have easily raised up men of equal talents in the first age of Christianity.

Will it be said that the prevalence of our doctrine is to be traced to dishonesty in the first teachers of Christianity? That divine goodness made ample provision for the promulgation of the truth, and that the agents to whom the work was committed,

were not true to their trust? This is a grave charge. Were Christ and his apostles base deceivers? Did they conceal the messages they were sent to teach, and substitute doctrines perfectly at variance with universalism? What motive could have prompted them to withhold the sentiment that sin will meet with no future punishment, and teach in its stead the stern doctrine of endless misery? It is impossible to assign any reason for a measure like this. Why did they persevere in teaching error when they gained nothing but persecution, and when they had only to announce the welcome doctrine, that sin will not be punished hereafter, to become the favorites of the world? Surely they were not dishonest teachers. They did believe what they taught. Did they then receive their instructions from God? Did he impart the doctrines that have prevailed in the world? The universalist says the doctrine is not true. Has the Almighty then sanctioned error? If so, where is his benevolence?

If he has not sanctioned the teachings of the apostles, why did he not send more successful teachers—men who could teach universalism as distinctly as modern preachers do?

The God of nature may withhold some of the discoveries of science, for centuries, without incurring the suspicion of a want of benevolence. It has not been essential to the welfare of the world to know, from the beginning of time, whether the earth or the sun is the centre of our planetary system, or how vessels may be propelled by steam, or railroads constructed. But the truths of religion are essential to our welfare. The universalist claims to go far beyond others in his conceptions of divine goodness; he contends that his doctrine is the needed remedy for human misery. Will he explain then why it is that a merciful God entrusted this remedy to agents, who were so incompetent or so unfaithful as to substitute for this blessing the poison of error and torture a suffering world with the doctrine of future punishment? Why divine benevolence did not impart sooner the vaunted specific? Why the doubts and fears of men were not removed entirely fifty centuries ago?

It is the favorite representation of the universalist, "If God be endowed with benevolence, he desires the salvation of all men. If omnipotent, he is able to save all. The doctrine of endless misery denies then either the power, or the benevolence of the Almighty?" Not to dwell upon the sophistical nature of this argument, we would contend that it may be retorted upon

the universalist. If universalism be the grand remedy for the errors and miseries of mankind, the benevolence of God must have inclined him to make it known in every past age, and over the whole earth. If God be omnipotent, he is able to execute his desires—then he must have made all men, in all ages, universalists. The recent origin of universalism, by this sort of argument, disproves either the benevolence or the power of the Almighty.

2. But universalism conflicts still more decidedly with the benevolence of God. It strips his character of all clemency.

Clemency consists in the remission of deserved punishment. It is no clemency to remit punishment that is unmerited; this is mere justice. Now, what deserved penalty is remitted by the Almighty, according to universalism?

Is it future and endless punishment? This the system denies to have been our desert. This penalty, we are told, is unrighteously severe, and cannot constitute the penalty of the divine law. It cannot be contended then that it is clemency to save us from a doom which we have never deserved, and to which we have never been exposed.

We are not to be told here, that Christ died to save sinners. Christ did not die to save men from undeserved perdition. The atonement must not be brought in thus as a mere make-weight in the system of the universalist. If it were unrighteous severity in God to threaten eternal ruin as the penalty of the law, it were no mercy to provide an atonement by which to save us from such ruin. This were cruel mockery, not divine compassion. The Son of God would not trifle with men by claiming the merit of surprising clemency, when to have failed to save us would have proved the sheerest injustice. How then is the clemency of God displayed? From what does divine mercy save men?

Universalists are shocked at the doctrine of future punishment. They labor hard to explain away those passages of Scripture which announce a future judgment and the final condemnation of sinners. They assert that no punishment is to be feared after death. They admit with us that God has expressed for our race the most adorable compassion. They, as well as ourselves, believe the frequent and strong professions of clemency which the Lord has recorded in the sacred volume. We can unite in extolling the mercy of God. They will exclaim with us, in the liveliest admiration "God is love."

When we admire the clemency of Heaven, we mean that clemency which saves us from the woes of hell. We adore the grace that can rescue lost sinners from a perdition which they deserve. We can exclaim with rapture, "thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." We can look upward, with observing angels, to the stupendous height, and downward to the unsearchable depths of that love which ransomed guilty men from the woes of an eternal imprisonment. We behold here, as we imagine, a topic that ought to call forth the grateful raptures of every heart.

According to the system of universalism, however, our raptures are wholly unnecessary. As there is no endless perdition, there can be no future salvation. Suppose it were possible to prove that we have not been ransomed from eternal ruin. We cannot blot from the Scriptures the glowing records of divine goodness. The universalist cannot deny while he receives the Bible, that we are said to be under the highest obligations to the Son of God, that the clemency of heaven is said to have made unparalleled exertions to save our race—that God claims from us the most rapturous gratitude for the actual exercise of surprising mercy.

Where is this clemency seen? From what does the Son of God save men?

It must be only from evils in this world, if we credit the assertions of the universalist. From what earthly evils does the Son of God save men?

Let it be recollected that it is a doctrine of universalism, that men suffer in this world according to their deserts, and thus endure the penalty of the law. It is not from punishment on earth then that we are saved by divine mercy. Punishment we are said to suffer literally and fully. Universalism makes God as unrelenting as the severest task-master. According to this system, he inflicts without mitigation and without mercy the entire penalty of transgression. He is held up to our view as an almighty Shylock, who stands over the sinner with unyielding sternness, unwilling to abate in the slightest degree the demands of justice. We know that universalism professes to regard Christ as a Saviour, but, at the same time, with glaring contradiction, it avows that we are punished as much as we deserve in this life. Here then is no room for the services of a Saviour. We cannot be punished by justice and saved by mercy at the same time. The convict, who serves out his time of

confinement in the cell of a prison, obtains his discharge as an act of justice, not of mercy. To offer him pardon, after he has suffered the full penalty, is to insult and wrong him.

The mercy of God saves us from no punishment in this world, according to universalism. From what then does it save us?

When the force of this representation is felt, the reply usually is, that we are saved from sin.

There is an important sense in which Christ saves his forgiven people from the power of sin. But this is not what the universalist means, when he says that we are saved from sin. If the phrase "to save us from sin" mean any thing, according to his system, it must mean to save us in such a sense from the power of sin, that we do not become sinners. In this sense Christ does not save us from sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves. All sin, and all suffer more or less the consequences of sinning. From what then does the Redeemer save us? We are not saved from future punishment, or from punishment in this life, or from our sins. We are saved—from nothing. Does the alleged clemency of God then expend its vast energies in doing nothing? Does prophecy, from the beginning of time, pour its multiplying and brightening rays upon a stupendous effort of divine mercy that is to prove at last nothing but a splendid bubble? Does the projected scheme of man's redemption kindle the piety and animate the lyres of ancient prophets? Does it awaken thrilling interest among the heavenly hosts? Does the Son of God, at length, descend to an expecting world? Is the tragedy of redemption brought to its mournful close? Is it pronounced that the vast and eventful work is finished? Does the scene excite the most intense interest among angelic spirits? Does the triumphant Redeemer ascend again to heaven to receive afresh the praises of the universe—and is this all for nothing? Are the reiterated promises and the glowing appeals of the New Testament grounded upon nothing? Is the extolled clemency of heaven nothing but an empty name? It is, if universalism be true.

It is justice, not goodness, to enforce rigorously the demands of law. According to the tenets of universalism, there is no remission of sin, no expiatory atonement, no grace, no clemency. If men obey, they are rewarded as an act of justice; if they sin, they expiate their own guilt by enduring the full amount of

punishment. And yet this system claims the merit of showing forth to a surpassing extent, the glory of divine benevolence !

The favorite appeals of the friends of this system might be retorted upon themselves in greater number. We have restricted ourselves to but three points, the justice, the competency, and the benevolence of God. The length of the article admonishes us to bring these remarks to a close. We shall conclude with expressing the hope that the continued existence and spread of universalism will attract more than they have yet done the attention of the friends of truth, and elicit from them such countervailing exertions as will save our flocks through the divine blessing, from the encroachments of this moral gangrene.

ARTICLE V.

MISSIONARY SCHOOLS.

By Rev. Rufus Anderson, D. D., one of the Secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Boston.

It is thought by some, that modern missionaries among the heathen give too much attention to schools, and that they do this at the expense of time which ought to be devoted to the preaching of the gospel. There may have been something to justify this opinion in a few of the missions, especially in their earlier stages. In general, however, the impression is probably a mistaken one ; at least in respect to the missions with which I am acquainted. The misapprehension may be owing to two causes. First, in the annual reports of missionary societies, the statistics of education are usually given more in detail and with greater precision and prominence, than those of preaching—a result not easily avoided. Secondly, the precise object of education, as a part of the system of modern missionary operations, appears not to have been generally understood hitherto by the community. Perhaps I ought to add, that its proper object has not always been well understood by the directors of missions. What this object is, will be explained in the sequel.

The proportionate attention given by missionaries to schools, is by no means as great as many seem to suppose. Those who attended the last annual meeting of the American Board of

Commissioners for Foreign Missions, will remember the result of inquiries on this subject there proposed to the Rev. William Richards, of the Sandwich Islands mission. It appeared that not only was the average attendance of natives on preaching, at the fifteen stations of that mission, greater than it is in any one considerable district of our own country, but that the missionaries preached oftener than is here customary among the settled pastors. And in general, the missionaries of that board among the heathen will bear comparison, in respect to the frequency of their preaching, with their more zealous brethren in the pastoral office at home. And the same is no doubt true of the missionaries of other societies.

Still it is admitted, that schools constitute a prominent part of the system of modern missions, and that there is no evidence of their having formed any part of the missions prosecuted by the apostles. The inquiry therefore is very natural and proper. *Why this departure from apostolical usage?* To this inquiry the present article is designed to furnish a reply.

Our first object will be to ascertain *the extent of territory embraced by the apostolical missions.*

The inspired history gives no information that the apostles and their companions extended their personal labors beyond the Roman empire. Fabricius has collected from the New Testament the names of all the places there mentioned, at which they planted churches, some forty or fifty in number; and also the names of the different countries which they are said to have visited.* These countries were Judea, Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Illyricum, Greece, Italy, and the islands of Cyprus and Crete, with several others of less note. Mesopotamia should probably be added, on the strength of 1 Pet. 5: 13. All the principal districts or provinces of Asia Minor are named in the Acts of the Apostles. The parts of Arabia in which Paul spent several years, are supposed to have been adjacent to Damascus, and within the modern Syria; and there is no evidence in Scripture that this apostle actually made his contemplated journey into Spain. The whole territory, therefore, traversed by the apostolical missionaries, so far as the Scriptures inform us, was within the Roman empire, and formed but a part of it; and, so far as territory is concerned, but little more than

* Fabricii Lux Evan. exoriens, etc. p. 83.

was afterwards governed by the eastern or Byzantine emperors.*

If we inquire what further light ecclesiastical history throws on this subject, we shall not be able greatly to extend the travels and labors of the apostles. Mosheim gives it as the result of his researches, that "the stories often told respecting their travels among the Gauls, the Britons, the Spaniards, the Germans, the Americans, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Russians, are too recent and fantastic to be received by an inquisitive lover of the truth." "A great part of these fabulous stories," he continues, "were got up after the days of Charlemagne; when most of the christian churches contended as vehemently about the antiquity of their origin, as ever the Arcadians, Egyptians and Greeks did." Dr. Murdock, the American translator of Mosheim, believes—chiefly in view of the authorities quoted by Fabricius—that Peter, after preaching long in Judea and other parts of Syria, probably visited Babylon, Asia Minor, and finally Rome; that Paul, after his captivity, visited Judea, Asia Minor and Greece, and returned to Rome, but did not proceed further westward than Italy; that John, after remaining many years in Judea, removed to Ephesus, where, excepting the time of his banishment to Patmos, he remained till his death; that James the younger (the elder James was put to death by Herod) spent his life in Judea; and that Andrew probably labored on the shores of the Black Sea near the modern Constantinople, and perhaps in Greece. "Philip," he adds, "either the apostle or the evangelist, is reported to have ended his days at Hierapolis, in Phrygia. Thomas seems to have travelled eastward, to Parthia, Media, Persia and India. Bartholomew took perhaps a more southern course, and preached in Arabia. Matthew is also reported to have travelled east, in the Modern Persia. Of Simon the Canaanite, nothing to be relied on can be said. Thaddeus, Lebbeus, or Jude the brother of James, the author of an epistle, is reputed to have preached at Edessa, in the north of Syria. Of the companions of the apostles—Timothy, after accompanying Paul many years, is said to have been stationed at Ephesus, where he suffered martyrdom under Domitian or Nerva. Titus, another companion of Paul, is reported to have been stationed in Crete, where he died. Mark, or John surnamed Mark, at-

* The countries mentioned Acts 2: 9—11; add Media and Parthia to the above named.

tended - Paul and afterwards Peter, and probably preached the gospel in Egypt. Of Luke, little can be said, except that he accompanied Paul, and wrote the book of Acts and a Gospel. Of Barnabas, nothing can be said worth relating, except what is learned from the New Testament.—From this account, imperfect as it is, we may conclude that the apostles and their companions scarcely extended their labors beyond the boundaries of the present Turkish empire.”*

To the countries, then, which are mentioned in the New Testament as favored with the missionary labors of the apostles and their companions, ecclesiastical history adds Egypt, Southern Arabia, Persia, Media, Parthia, and India. But we have nothing that throws light on their manner of proceeding in these countries. For information of this kind, we must look solely to the missions described in the New Testament. These were in Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, Italy, and the islands of Cyprus and Crete. I say Crete, for although we have no account of the labors of the apostle Paul in that island, we have his epistle to Titus, instructing him how to proceed in his mission to the Cretans.—I omit Judea, as being the source of the missions, and not a heathen country.

Our next inquiry relates to *the state of education in these countries.*

The mere mention of Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece and Italy, is enough for the reader of history. What were they in those times but the very foci of civilization? Where were other countries in the wide world, to be compared with them in this respect? And the time, too, in which the apostolical missions were performed, was it not in the palmy age of Roman literature? But though the evidence of the high state of general civilization and individual intelligence in those countries at that period, is unquestionable, it is not easy to show precisely what means of education were possessed by the people at large, nor to what extent the multitude was actually educated.

Two events must have exerted a powerful influence on the minds of men and on the tone of education throughout the field traversed by the apostles;—viz. the general dispersion of the Greeks, with their language and philosophy; and the general dispersion of the Jews, with their inspired books and their religion.

* Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. vol. I. p. 55, 56—Note.

The Macedonians, upon the conquests of Alexander the Great, planted their colonies everywhere. They built Grecian cities even in Media. "On the Tigris, Seleucia was principally inhabited by Greeks: to the southeast was the magnificent Ctesiphon; and to the northwest was Sitace. Babylon imitated Macedonia; in its neighborhood lived Greeks and Macedonians. From thence along the Euphrates upwards lay Nicephorium, a Grecian city, surrounded also by other Greek towns; and further on in Mesopotamia was Charrae, a settlement of the Macedonians. But not to enter into details, we refer (in Appian) to a large catalogue of cities in Further and Hither Syria, which were reckoned to the Greeks. Tigranes, the Armenian, in his march to Phenicia by way of Syria, destroyed no less than twelve Greek cities. Between Syria and Babylonia we meet with the ruins of Palmyra, on which are found more Greek than Palmyrene inscriptions. Even some written in the Palmyrene character, are nevertheless in their language Greek. In Hither Syria, on the boundaries of Palestine, and in Palestine itself, the Greeks, as was natural from the situation and neighborhood, made still greater intrusions." Antioch, the capital of Syria, was peopled by its founder with Greeks and Macedonians, and acquired a reputation for Greek refinement and science. Tyre and Sidon adopted the Greek language. Caesarea was peopled chiefly by Greeks. Gadara and Hippos, on the east of the Jordan, became Greek cities, and the former possessed men learned in Greek science. So also did Gaza, a city on the southwest border of Judea. Philadelphia, east of the Jordan, is still majestic in its Grecian ruins. Indeed the country east of the Jordan, was towards the north Greek, and towards the south mostly in possession of the Greeks.*

In this manner were the Greek language, manners and institutions generally diffused. As early as the time of Cato, that language was understood and spoken throughout the civilized world. Homer was read in Persia, and it is supposed even in India. In Carthage navigators described their voyages of dis-

* Hug on the prevalence of the Greek language in Palestine, etc. *Bib. Repos.* Vol. I. pp. 536—550. Prof. Pfannkuche, in his dissertation on the prevalence of the Aramean language in the same country in the time of the apostles, restricts the use of the Greek to narrower limits. *Bib. Repos.* Vol. I. pp. 317—363. The reader will incline to the views taken by Prof. Hug.

covery, and Hannibal wrote a history of his wars, in the language of the Greeks.* “Græca leguntur,” says Cicero, “in omnibus fere gentibus.” During the reign of Augustus, the study of the Grecian philosophy was so generally prevalent, that almost every statesman, lawyer and man of letters was conversant with the writings of the philosophers. This philosophy originally embraced all inquiries about the nature of God, the origin and destiny of man, and the phenomena and powers of the material world. Afterwards the consideration of physical topics was to a great extent excluded. Socrates, as is well known, exerted his influence to direct the investigations of philosophy to subjects in morals and religion, and in social and political economy. It is no doubt true, that comparatively few of the people knew anything of the different sects of Grecian philosophy, yet the fact that their disciples were so generally dispersed, must have had no small influence on the minds of men.†

A consideration of the schools and the public libraries which are known to history, will assist our impressions as to the state of education in those large cities; in which were the *recorded* labors of the apostles and their associates. Athens for many ages had been renowned for her schools; and though at one time these were removed to Alexandria, and at another suffered much in the conquest of Greece by the Romans, yet they revived, and were resorted to from all quarters by those who were eager for learning. They even survived the incursion of the Gauls in the fourth century, and continued to flourish till after the time of Justinian. In the period under consideration they had rivals at Apollonia on the western shore of Macedonia, where Augustus finished his education, not far south of Illyricum and Dalmatia; at Rhodes; at Pergamus, where was one of the seven churches; at Tarsus, the birth-place of Paul; and especially at Alexandria in Egypt. The law school at Berytus, in Syria, was of a subsequent date; and the schools of Antioch, Smyrna, Caesarea, Edessa and Seleucia, were of christian origin, and arose after the death of the apostles. The christian school at Alexandria was opened in the latter part of the second century. But the school of pagan philosophy in that city, at the era of our Saviour’s advent, was thronged from

* Schlegel’s Hist. of Literature, Vol. I. p. 111.

† Eschenburg’s Manual of Class. Lit. translated and edited by Prof. Fiske; and Eufield’s Hist. of Philosophy.

all quarters, and is said to have sent forth eminent philosophers of every sect to distant countries. The celebrated library at Alexandria needs no description. About one hundred and fifty years before Christ, Pergamus contained a library of 200,000 volumes, rivalling the collection of the Ptolemies. Before the era of our missions, Mark Antony had presented it to Cleopatra, to replace the one in the Museum, which had been destroyed by Julius Cæsar during the siege of Alexandria.

As to the influence of the Jews in their dispersion, it may be remarked, that as long ago as the reign of Ahasuerus, or Artaxerxes Longimanus, they were found in considerable numbers in all the provinces of Persia. The evidence of this is in the book of Esther. At the commencement of the christian missions, this people were dispersed over the Roman empire. The geographer Strabo, quoted by Josephus, says, "The Jews have already passed into every city; nor were it easy to find any place in the world, which has not received this nation and been occupied by it." Strabo flourished in the Augustan age. At that time, the antiquities and sacred books of the Jews began to attract the attention of pagan scholars, and conversions from paganism to Judaism were not uncommon. Synagogues, composed in great measure of proselytes, existed in many of the Grecian cities. Schools are said to have been common among the Jews; and no one can doubt that this dispersion of the Jews must have had a great effect on the gentile mind.*

From all this it would seem, that education and knowledge must have been considerably prevalent in the countries where were the missions described in the New Testament. Especially is it almost certain that men of education would be found in those cities generally, in which they gathered churches. Some of them would already be among the proselytes to Judaism, and it is highly probable that these would occasionally embrace the christian faith. The apostle Paul does indeed say, that "not many wise men after the flesh" were called. By these he may perhaps have meant the philosophers. It was, however, then no doubt much as it is now. In every city where converts were multiplied, there were a few from the less proud and ambitious classes of educated men. These would be superior to most of the apostles in respect to mere learning, and sometimes, it may be, quite equal to Paul himself, the best educa-

* Eschenburg's Manual, etc. p. 282.

ted among the apostolical missionaries. In point of fact, the standard of education among the Gentiles, in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece and Rome, was at that time higher, than it was among the Jews, and the amount of education was greater.

I am now prepared to state some facts, illustrative of the apostolical missions, which are important to the main object of this discussion. One of the most prominent of these is, the small number of missionaries sent by the Holy Ghost into the several heathen countries. The New Testament gives no evidence that more than three apostles visited Asia Minor. If we call in the aid of ecclesiastical history, we have but four. To these add Barnabas, Luke, Mark, Silas and Apollos, and there are but nine missionaries in all. Timothy was a native of the country. So was Titus ; at least he was a Greek. The list of the seventy disciples now extant, which would make nearly all the Christians named in the Epistles to be missionaries sent from Judea, is rejected by ecclesiastical writers as fictitious. But even if this list were authentic, it would then appear that not more than a dozen missionaries were sent to the countries of Asia Minor ; and, excepting Syria, no other country appears to have been so much favored in this respect.

Now we are told that Paul and Barnabas, in their missionary tour through Asia Minor, "ordained elders in every church." Whom did they ordain ? Sixteen cities are named where there were churches, and passages might be quoted from the Acts and Epistles, implying that a far greater number of churches were planted. Paul also informs Titus, that he had left him in Crete, among other reasons, that he might "ordain elders in every city." Whom ? Not men sent for the purpose from the churches of Judea. Not missionaries. The elders thus ordained were chosen from among the native converts themselves.

Such was the usage of the apostles. They preached the gospel. Converts were multiplied. These were embodied in a society, and one or more of their number best qualified by talent, education, or miraculous gifts, or it may be in all these ways, were ordained over them in the Lord.

Now, in what manner did the apostles obtain, in every city, men qualified for such a trust ?

It appears that their missionary labors, so far as they are recorded in the New Testament, were in the best educated, and in some respects highly educated, portions of the world ; that

they were chiefly in cities, and, excepting Rome and a few others, in Grecian cities, including most of those which were distinguished for learning and general civilization in those times; that in most places they must have preached more or less to educated men, rendering it not improbable that some of these were among their converts; and that these men, with some special instructions in the knowledge of the gospel, would be fitted to preach the gospel and take the pastoral charge of churches. During the three years Paul spent at Ephesus, and the year and a half he labored at Corinth, he might have trained numerous candidates for the ministry. Wherever the apostles went preaching the gospel, they found mind in that erect, intelligent, reasoning posture, which is the result of civilization—a more learned and refined civilization even, than existed in the communities from which the missionaries themselves proceeded.

It would seem, however, that whatever was the amount of education in the communities favored with the labors of the apostles, it was impossible to supply the gentile churches properly with teachers, without a miraculous agency; for, in these churches, the Holy Ghost saw fit to put forth a supernatural influence to raise up prophets, teachers and governors, that they might the more speedily and effectually be built up in the faith and order of the gospel.

On this subject, Mosheim gives his opinion as follows:—
“As there were but few among the first professors of Christianity, who were learned men and competent to instruct the rude and uninformed on religious subjects, it became necessary that God should raise up in various churches extraordinary teachers, who could discourse to the people on religious subjects in their public assemblies, and address them in the name of God. Such were the persons, who in the New Testament are called *prophets*. Rom. 12: 6. 1 Cor. 12: 28. 14: 3, 29. Eph. 4: 11. The functions of these men are limited too much by those, who make it to have been their sole business to expound the Old Testament Scriptures, and especially the prophetic books. Whoever professed to be such a herald of God, was allowed publicly to address the people; but there were present among the hearers divinely constituted judges, who could by infallible criteria discriminate between true and false prophets. The order of prophets ceased, when the necessity for them was past.”*

* Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Vol. I. p. 83.

But Neander is more explicit in some admirable passages in his "History of the Planting and Progress of the Christian Church under the Apostles," translated from the German by Professor Robinson for one of the early volumes of this work.* The passages to which I refer contain the views entertained by that eminent ecclesiastical historian concerning the nature and operation of the gifts of *teaching* and *prophecy*. He believes both of these endowments, as well as the gifts of tongues, miracles, signs and wonders, to have been above the course of nature. The teachers he understands to be such persons as had been in some measure prepared, by a previous culture of the receptive and communicative faculties of the understanding, to develop and communicate that, which the illumination of the Spirit revealed to them, in a connected series of doctrinal instruction. Their christian knowledge, according to Neander, they "acquired for themselves through a self-agency quickened by the Holy Spirit—a self-agency which developed and wrought into form the truths perceived by them through this divine illumination. The prophet, on the contrary, spoke as he was impelled by the might of sudden inspiration at the moment; yielding to a sudden elevation of his higher self-consciousness, to a light which here burst upon him, he spoke according to a revelation. Hence the two gifts of teaching and prophecy might be possessed by the same person. In many moments of inspiration, the teacher might rise into the prophet. In such a state of mind the prophet uttered incidental and powerful addresses for the awakening, exhortation, warning, and consolation of the church; or such addresses to those who had not yet embraced the faith, as might serve to arouse their conscience and so prepare the way in their minds for the instruction of the *διδάσκαλος*. It is manifest, what an influence this power of inspired discourse, which wrought so especially upon the feelings, must have had at this period for the spread of the gospel. There came often into the congregations, persons, who only wished once to see what was done in the christian assemblies; or who only wished to become acquainted with the christian doctrine, of the divine character of which they were by no means convinced. In these assemblies there now stand forth men, who testify with overwhelming power to the corruption of human nature and the universal need of an atonement; they

* Bib. Repos. Vol. IV. pp. 241—277.

speak from the depths of their own religious and moral consciousness to that of the other, as if they could read it to the bottom. The heathen feels himself stricken in conscience ; his heart is as it were unlocked before him ; he must acknowledge what before he could not believe, that the power of God is with this doctrine, that it dwells among these men.*

“ If now the connected instruction of the *διδάσκαλος*, teacher, served to lead on to further knowledge those who had already embraced the faith ; or further to uphold them in the intelligent consciousness of that which they had received in the faith ; it was in like manner the province of the *προφητεία*, prophecy, to bring over to the faith those who were not believers ; or, in those who were already in the faith, to quicken anew and strengthen their faith, and stir up anew in them the life of faith.”

Another passage, which I extract from the same author, relates to the *discerning or distinguishing of spirits*, which was also a supernatural gift among the gentile churches of the apostolical age.

“ The christian life,” he says, “ was to be allowed in the church to develop and declare itself with freedom. Whoever felt an inward impulse, was permitted to speak in the assemblies of the church ; but self-possession was to accompany inspiration side by side ; and it was from this very circumstance that the latter was to be known to be genuine. No one was permitted to speak alone and exclusively ; no one was to interrupt another.† If now Paul held it to be necessary to give such directions, it follows, that he by no means recognized the prophets in the church to be such untroubled *media* or organs of the divine Spirit, as not easily to mingle the divine and human together. Against the prevalence of such an intermixture and the delusions flowing from it, if that which was human and impure were given out as the inspiration of the Holy Spirit,—against this the churches were to be protected by a trying of the spirits, in the exercise of a gift bestowed on individuals for this special purpose.” ‡

Neander is of opinion that the “ word of knowledge” and the “ word of wisdom”§ were distinctions in the gift of teaching ;—

* 1 Cor. 14: 25.

† 1 Cor. 14: 30—32.

‡ 1 Cor. 14: 29. 1 John 4: 1.

§ 1 Cor. 12: 8.

the one referring to "the capacity for unfolding the christian doctrine *theoretically* in its constituent parts;" the other referring to "the capacity for applying it *practically* to the particular relations and circumstances of life."

The *gift of church government* ("governments," 1 Cor. 12: 28) Neander explains as a special talent quickened by the Holy Ghost, designed to qualify individuals for the station of officers in the church. These were called *πρεσβύτεροι*, presbyters, elders, or *ἐπίσκοποι*, overseers; both names referring to one and the same office, and both synonymous. It was such the apostles ordained over the churches they gathered among the Gentiles. The *gift of helps* he understands as having reference to the various services required in administering the affairs of the church, as the superintendence of alms and the care of the sick; and to this class probably belonged the gift of miraculous cures.

In respect to the *gift of tongues*, this writer follows the mode of explanation now common among his countrymen, regarding it as designed solely for the benefit of the possessor. His views are founded upon 1 Cor. xiv. Our view of it, in common with that generally entertained by Christians in this country and Great Britain, is founded on Acts 2: 11. We regard the endowment as designed to enable the first missionaries and the prophets and teachers in the different churches to instruct others who spoke languages foreign from their own.

"The gift of foreign tongues," says Mosheim, "appears to have gradually ceased as soon as many nations became enlightened with the truth and numerous churches of Christians were everywhere established; for it became less necessary than it was at first. But the other gifts, with which God favored the rising church of Christ, were, as we learn from numerous testimonies of the ancients, still conferred [i. e. in the second century] on particular persons here and there."* There is reason to think that they did not wholly cease until sometime in the third century.

Thus were the apostolical churches among the heathen furnished with religious teachers and guides. The apostles (excepting Paul) after spending three years in the most intimate connection with one who spake as never man spake—in a school for which any candidate for the ministry would gladly exchange

* Mosheim, vol. I. p. 125.

the most favored of the halls of science—were wondrously endowed by the Holy Ghost with miraculous gifts and graces. Paul, pre-eminently the apostle to the Gentiles, spent his youth, probably, in the schools of Tarsus, but completed his education at the feet of Gamaliel in Jerusalem. He received his knowledge of the gospel by immediate revelation; “for I neither received it,” says he, “of man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” Next were the evangelists, often companions of the apostles in travels and labors, also endowed supernaturally for the work of missions. Next came prophets, teachers, etc., in the several churches. And these supernatural gifts appear not to have been restricted to one or two members of each church, but, sometimes at least, were bestowed, for mutual edification, upon numerous members, if not upon all.*

Now we must believe that the Holy Ghost would not have exerted this supernatural agency upon the minds of the first Christians, had it been unnecessary. And whence the necessity? Why were their minds strengthened, made the subjects of a spiritual illumination, and endowed with a facility and force of utterance beyond the reach of their natural powers in their circumstances? And why was this supernatural agency gradually withdrawn, as the churches became more enlightened by education, and able to train up her own teachers in her schools at Alexandria, Caesarea, Antioch, Edessa, and elsewhere? It has been said that the church grieved away the Spirit by her corruptions and follies. But it is far more reasonable to suppose, that the agency was withdrawn because the exigency which called for it had ceased.

We now turn our attention to modern missions, and *contrast their circumstances with those of the missions described in the New Testament.*

Modern missions have been sent to the Oriental churches, to the Mohammedans, and to—omitting some small districts—the pagan nations in western and southern Africa, India, the Archi-

* 1 Cor. 14: 23, “If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and *all* speak with tongues. v. 24, “If *all* prophesy.” v. 26, “When ye be come together, *every one of you* hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation.” v. 29—31, “Let the prophets speak *two or three*, and let the others judge. If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may *all* prophesy one by one.”

pelago, Polynesia, and the territories occupied by the native tribes of North America. The Oriental churches and the Mohammedans occupy most of the countries that were the scene of the apostolical missions. These I pass by at present, to contrast the circumstances of the modern and ancient missions to pagan nations.

One obvious and most important fact in modern missions to the heathen is, that they are prosecuted in the less civilized, and to a great extent in uncivilized, portions of the world. What heathen nation of these times will compare with the nations visited by the apostles? India is partially civilized; the rest are in a state of barbarism, and most of them, except as they have been affected by the gospel, are absolutely savage. On the score of education and intelligence, they stand immeasurably below the Greeks and Romans. The aboriginal-American, the Polynesian, and the African nations were without an alphabet until they received it from the missionaries. The larger nations of the Indian Archipelago have long had the use of letters, but scarcely one in forty of the inhabitants can read, and books of every kind are rare. Concerning India, the Abbé Dubois is good authority, except where he speaks of Protestant missions. He says the brahmins regard the sciences as their own exclusive property, that they make a mystery of them to the vulgar, and have always taken the greatest pains to prevent their spread among other classes of men. At the same time they have themselves made no progress in learning beyond their ancestors of the era of Pythagoras, and stand, with the whole body of the Hindoos, where they did two thousand years ago. It is worth while to add, that the sciences above referred to, which are the ones that in ancient times gave so much celebrity to the Indian philosophers, are astronomy, astrology and magic. The native schools now existing in India are so unlike those of Europe or America, and so inferior to them, as not to bear a comparison. The Abbé says they are in the larger towns, or within the precincts of some large temple, and are without method, or plan for study, or discipline, without excitement for the student, or encouragement for the teacher.*

I hesitate not to advance the proposition, that mind, in all the pagan nations, now open to missionaries, is in such a state that the converts, without either the supernatural gifts of early times, or the substitute for those gifts (imperfect as it may be) which

* Description of the People of India, Vol. I. p. 354.

is found in education, will not be fitted for the offices and duties of the christian church, nor to stand alone without the help of missionaries.

They need such extraneous influences far more than did the early converts. This is true of the nations of India ; and it is pre-eminently true of the more barbarous pagan nations in which the experiment of Protestant missions has been made. • How it would be in China, I do not know. A more thorough and practical discipline appears there to be given to the mind in the class of students called “*literati*,” than is known to any class of minds in India. But in the large portions of the heathen world just named, it is impossible, without either miraculous gifts, or education, fairly and fully to introduce the christian church, in any one of its existing forms ; or if introduced, there is no reason to believe that such churches could be sustained and flourish without the constant presence of missionaries. They could not on the plan of *Congregationalism* ;—for want of that intelligence and discretion among the members, which are so necessary where every man has a vote and a direct agency in the affairs of the church, and for want also of men qualified to act as deacons and committees. Even now, after all that has yet been done in the way of education, Congregational missionaries (and the same is equally true of all others) are obliged to exercise a governing influence in the churches they have gathered very analogous to that exercised by the apostles.—They could not on the plan of *Presbyterianism* ;—for want of suitable men to be entrusted, as ruling elders, with the government of the church.—Neither could they on the plan of *Episcopacy* ; for want of men qualified to perform the duties of priests and bishops. Indeed, the want of well qualified teachers and pastors would be equally felt, and equally fatal to success, whatever form should be given to the ecclesiastical organization. I repeat ; without either miraculous gifts, or that intellectual and moral discipline which is not ordinarily attained without more education than is to be found in the heathen world, the native churches, if left to themselves, would soon run into confusion, and the institutions of the gospel would perish from among them. One has but to study the writings of the apostolical Fathers to see, that even in their times—in the centre of the civilized world, and almost in the brightest period of ancient learning—the churches founded by the personal ministry of the apostles, as soon as miraculous gifts ceased, and earlier, were

kept with the greatest difficulty in the doctrines of the apostles.* And we know that it took the church three long centuries to acquire even the ascendancy in the Roman empire, and that the hour of her triumph may be regarded as the commencement of her decline. It would be an interesting inquiry, how far this slow progress, (it must be regarded as slow, if we take only the time into view,) and the early, rapid, and terrible decline of the church, followed by ages of darkness, were owing to the want of those very facilities for general education, with which God, chiefly through the medium of the press, has furnished his people in these latter days.

Not to pursue this subject, let us illustrate somewhat more the intellectual degradation, into which the great body of the present heathen world has fallen.

To how great an extent have all useful ideas perished from the minds of pagan nations! In those which make the greatest pretensions to learning, in India for instance, the researches of christian scholars have discovered that there is but little of truth on any subject. Their history, chronology, geography, astronomy, their philosophical notions of matter and mind, and their views of creation and providence, religion and morals, are exceedingly destitute of truth. It is not, however, so much vacuity of mind that we have here to contend with, as plenitude of error; the mind being filled with theories and systems of geography, astronomy, metaphysics and theology, all mingled together—the accumulations and perversions of three thousand years—and all claiming the same divine origin, the same infallibility and authority. So that, happily, even the simplest course of elementary instruction in schools, could not be otherwise than a direct attack upon their false religions; and the overthrow of any one of their systems of learning would be a subversion, in their apprehension, of theological error, and the substitution of theological truth.

But when we go beyond the limits of civilization, among the wild children of paganism living on our western wilderness, in Africa, and the islands of the sea, then it is vacuity of mind, and not a plenitude, we have to operate upon. The savage has few ideas, and those few relate to his physical experience and wants. The relations of things escape his attention. He sees only the objects just about him. He knows nothing of

* See Osburn on the Doctrinal Errors of the Apostolical and Early Fathers, *passim*.

geography ; nothing of astronomy ; nothing of history ; nothing of his own spiritual nature and destiny ; nothing of God. His mind, if it were possible for it in these circumstances to be expanded, would still be empty. It could not stand erect. It would have nothing to support it.

The worst consequence of all this in connection with the natural depravity of the savage, is that paralysis of the thinking power, especially on spiritual subjects, so often mentioned and lamented by missionaries. This indisposition to thought is well illustrated by the Rev. Lorrin Andrews, principal of the missionary Seminary at the Sandwich Islands, in an essay on native schools at the islands written about six years since.* I will quote a few of his more striking facts.

“The worst thing in their *reading*,” he says, speaking of the natives, “is, that they get no ideas. I have taken great pains to ascertain this fact, and I am convinced that ninety out of a hundred that are called readers, hardly know that any meaning ought to be attached to the words. Indeed a great many think there is a kind of mystery, or perhaps magic, in reading. Their notion is, that they must say over a word or two, or a sentence, and then from some quarter a thought will come to them—that is, when they have any thought at all. I have spent hours at a time, in the high school, trying to make the scholars believe that a word written on paper, or printed in a book, meant just the same thing as when spoken with the mouth.” — “The mass of the people,” he adds, “gain nothing from conversation with their countrymen who are better informed, as in enlightened countries, for they are all alike unthinking.” — “It is remarkable that we are obliged to teach in a formal manner many things to this people, which are easily understood by the most illiterate in civilized countries, or which they would find out by inference. We are called upon frequently to answer questions which appear to us foolish. To mention only one ; about three months ago, the wife of Kauwa, one of the Society Island teachers, died ; a very respectable and, I believe, pious woman. She died on the Sabbath day. Some few days after her death, the question was agitated among our Lahaina church members, whether or no she could now be happy ? And the conclusion pretty generally, if not universally, was that she must be miserable, since the last act of her life consisted in dying on the Sabbath ; in other words, break-

* See Appendix to the 25th Annual Report of the A. B. C. F. M.

ing the Sabbath ; and as they had been taught that there was no repentance after death, it was not discoverable at all by them how she could be saved. This reasoning was among the best informed people of Lahaina, who have enjoyed almost ten years of faithful instruction. Kaio, my teacher (in the native language), who for thought, reflection, and knowledge of the Scriptures stands third, if not second, in the island, was completely puzzled with the question, and came to me for a solution."

"The study of Colburn's Intellectual Arithmetic," says the same missionary, two years later, "has done more than all other books in teaching the scholars *to think*. Geography has greatly enlarged their views of things, and added much to their stock of knowledge. But for much mental discipline in a little space, this little book has exceeded all others they have yet had. After going half way through the book, they were astonished at themselves. When I commenced with it, they laughed at the simplicity of the questions on the first page, and said it was like the Child's Arithmetic.* I turned over thirty or forty pages of the manuscript, (the translation had not then been printed), and read off several questions. They thought of them a while, and said, nobody knows these things, they are exceedingly entangled. I told them they could soon comprehend them, if they would go straight on from the beginning of the book. They said, perhaps so. Sometime after they had passed over the place they thought so difficult, they asked me when they should get to the hard questions I had formerly read to them? On being told they had passed over those questions without making a mistake, they exclaimed, what fools we were!"

How very unlike the field which God has given us to cultivate among the heathen, to that cultivated by the apostles and their associates. Moreover, we go forth to our work without their power of performing miracles, and our converts must be built up in the faith and order of the gospel, and qualified to stand alone and extend the triumphs of the Redeemer of men, without those gifts of teaching, prophecy and government, which were supernaturally conferred on the first gentile converts.

Would any one, notwithstanding this vast difference of cir-

* Members of the high school, or seminary, were at that time adults.

cumstances, still restrict us to the single method of oral preaching, because only that was employed by the apostles? But why overlook the supernatural qualifications, the miraculous powers of the apostles! Why overlook the supernatural gifts conferred upon their converts? Why lose sight of the fact that the apostles did actually press into the service *all* the natural powers they possessed, *all* their intellectual acquisitions, *all* their gifts and graces, and *all* the providential facilities within their reach, and brought these all to bear to the utmost upon the people to whom they were sent? And would they not have been grateful for more power, and greater means and facilities? Would they not have used them if they could? Would not the apostle Paul, for instance, in the prosecution of his missions, have rejoiced in such providential facilities, as rail-roads by land; steam-boats by water; paper instead of papyrus, or parchment; printed books instead of manuscripts; bills of exchange, by means of which to remit the contributions of the Macedonian and Grecian churches to Jerusalem, rather than the necessity of sending messengers all the way thither to carry the money; and the log-line and compass, in that terrible tempest when for many days neither sun nor stars appeared? Would he not gladly have favored the whole body of his converts with the *reading*, as well as the *hearing*, of the word? And when laboring with his own hands at Corinth and Ephesus, because he deemed it inexpedient to be chargeable to the Christians of those cities, would it not have been grateful to his feelings and facilitated his missionary work, if some society in Judea could have relieved him from this necessity?

Nothing can be more illogical, than the objection brought against missionary schools, because the apostles established none. How many things the apostles omitted to do, which they would have done if they could. And how absurd to restrict the church of the nineteenth century to the means that were at its command in the first. Must no use be made of the numberless providential gifts to the church since then? Must no notice be taken of the subsequent changes in her circumstances? Must no regard be had for the very different attitude and relations of the pagan world towards her? The heathen to whom the church then sent her missions, were as well instructed in human science, as she was herself; now, the heathen are as much lower on the scale of intelligence, as the church is higher; and does this fact create no additional obligation?

Besides, where is the divine command to restrict ourselves to *one mode* of propagating the christian religion? The apostles certainly had *two*. They preached; and then, by the laying on of hands, they instrumentally conferred extraordinary gifts of teaching, prophecy, government, tongues and miracles on certain of the converts.* The first we do as they did; the second, in the only manner within our power, viz., by a course of instruction. And as the command to do a thing includes the means which are necessary for its performance, this, being essential to the accomplishment of the work enjoined, is also commanded. Moreover, by what authority do we limit the meaning of the Saviour's last command to the public, oral, formal proclamation of it to a congregation? When has it been shown, that the apostles delivered sermons in the manner of modern times?—And why make *adults* the only object contemplated by the injunction? Should the gospel not also be proclaimed to youth and children, and the manner of proclaiming it be suited to their years? Why tie up this blessed command, so full of good will for mankind, to one single method of conferring the benefit? Why limit its applicability to one single combination of circumstances? Is the consecrated church the only place where the gospel can be, where it ought to be preached? May the gospel not be preached in an upper, private room? May it not be preached, in conversational tones and manner, to a single family? May it not be preached by the way-side to a single traveller? May it not be preached in the Bible-class, and Sabbath school, and even in the week-day school; and then may not the *media* of truth, common in such circumstances, be employed to make it known to the youthful mind? I would ask, too, if *the writing of Paul's Epistles* was not an act of obedience to the command under consideration? No one doubts that it was; and if so, and if a copy of his Epistle to the Colossians was made out for the church of the Laodiceans,† was not the copying of the epistle in obedience both to the letter and spirit of the Saviour's command? And when we, availing ourselves of the manifold copying powers of the press, *print* this epistle and the other portions of the word of God, and distribute them by thousands, is not this obeying the command? And when we teach the unlettered to read

* Rom. 1: 11. Acts 8: 17. 1 Tim. 4: 14. Acts 19: 6.

† Col. 4: 16.

the word of God for themselves, and thus enable them to confer the same ability on others, and to grow more in knowledge and grace than they otherwise would, is not this also obeying the command? Yes verily; it is intelligent obedience. For the printing of the word of God, and teaching men to read it, are not something different from the work enjoined. They are not designed to open and smooth the way for the gospel. They are not *preparatory* work. They are the very work itself—as much so as the conferring of miraculous gifts of prophecy and teaching, or the writing of the Gospels, or the inspired Epistles anciently were. The schools are—if they are what they ought to be—nurseries of piety, places and means for the direct inculcation of gospel truth in youthful minds and hearts. They are folds where the lambs of the flock are to be fed.

Lest I should be misunderstood I will say here—what will more fully appear in the sequel—that a due proportion is to be observed in the different parts of the work. The different gifts, like the different members of the body, though all essential to the completeness of the whole, have their relative degrees of importance, and should each be kept in their several places, and each have no more than their respective proportions of time. Preaching has the first place. It has that place at home, and it has it and should have it abroad. It is the grand means of operating upon the conscience and heart. It is the grand means of conversion. In some form or other, adapted to the circumstances of the missionary, it should be the leading pursuit of his life. In every mission it should be the focal point, the ultimate, grand object, the final cause with the members in all their plans.

It is time now to state, more precisely, *what place education should hold in the system of modern missions.*

1. If we were to regard education simply as a convenient method of inculcating a knowledge of the gospel on minds of a certain class, still it may properly be used by the missionary. So far as heathen youth are concerned, it is found in practice to be the only method of getting early access to their minds, the only method of preaching the gospel to them. It is often the most direct and effectual means of bringing others, and especially parents, under the preached gospel.* The visitation and

* Acts 19: 9.

superintendence of schools also gives a fine field of usefulness to missionaries recently come upon the ground, and not enough acquainted with the native language to preach formally to the adults. It is almost the only thing they can do ; and in the larger missions there will almost always be some missionaries in this condition.

2. In barbarous pagan countries, if we could make any use of the press and the printed word of God, elementary schools are indispensable. If we withhold the Bible from the pagan, no matter how, in what respect does our policy differ from that of the church of Rome ? I need not say that books and the press are useless in a community which cannot read.

3. Ages of experience in protestant Christendom have shown, that connecting a small system of schools with the stated and frequent preaching of the gospel, is wise as a means of increasing the effect of preaching and the durability of its influence. And if it be so within the bounds of Christendom, why not beyond ? The ministry throughout the world, acts under one and the same commission, and is governed by one and the same code of laws. The gospel they preach is the same. Human nature, with which they have to deal, is the same. If the circumstances differ, as they do very greatly, the difference only shows the greater need of connecting schools with preaching among those who know not the gospel. The ordained missionary will indeed engage no more than is necessary in their elementary instruction. He will commit this as soon as may be to native teachers. But when occupying a fixed station, he will no more be without such schools than the pastor at home, and no more will he withhold from them his fostering care, and watchful guardianship. The missionary who has these schools around him, and the missionary who has them not, will do well from year to year to compare their respective congregations, and the results of their preaching. Let their native churches also be compared, and their prospects among the rising generation.

4. After all, we cannot undertake to educate the youth of the whole heathen world, nor even any considerable proportion of them. The labor and the expense are both out of the question. Whatever it may be proper or desirable for us to do, in a general point of view, the scantiness of the means placed at the disposal of missionary societies renders it expedient, yea unavoidably necessary, that schools at the expense of such so-

cieties be established on a limited scale. We can educate only the few, and they must educate the many. Our pupils, as far as possible, should be select, and selected with some regard to the ulterior employment of the most promising of them as helpers in the mission. Our schools should be model schools. They should be nurseries of teachers. They should be introductory to the higher seminary, and preparatory to it. The preached gospel must at all events be sustained, and the number of schools should be regulated by the means placed at the disposal of the society, and the balance remaining of what is appropriated to the mission, after providing for the support of its preaching members. Still I must doubt,—if missionaries are not to be mere itinerants, if they are to have a fixed residence and operate within the bounds of some one district,—whether the church has any right to insist upon their laboring wholly without schools; or, in other words, without a system of means in operation around them for rearing up native helpers and successors in their work. Do the Scriptures confer any such right on the churches? Do they impose any such obligation on the missionary? Had missionaries the power of conferring supernatural gifts by the laying on of their hands, as the apostles and some of their associates had, the case would be very different.

5. While I assert the legitimate use of schools as one of the means of propagating the gospel in foreign missions, and while I maintain the right of missionaries to be furnished with them to a certain extent, I would suggest a general rule in relation to their establishment; having respect in this rule to the average amount of funds which experience has shown may be relied on by missionary societies, and the proportionate demand which will be made on these for sending forth and supporting preachers of the gospel. The rule is this;—*That the system of education, in all its parts, so far as it is supported by the funds of the mission, should have a direct reference to the training up of native teachers and preachers.* To this, in the smaller missions, and also in the less concentrated missions, there must be exceptions. A liberal construction should always be given to it. In some missions, as among the Tamul people of Ceylon and South India, the rule itself may require a considerable number of schools;—to awaken attention, give tone to the public mind with respect to education, furnish a better selection, give importance to the subject in the view of the select pupils, open a field for the occasional trial of their powers while pursuing their studies, and strengthen their motives to arrive at

high attainments. Still, whatever scope is allowed for the exercise of discretion in arranging and managing the details of the system, there will be a great practical advantage in having the one definite object proposed by this rule. And it is a question, whether missions themselves ought not to be established, organized, and prosecuted with more reference to the same end. Are not many of our missions modelled as they should be, if our object and expectation were to furnish a *full* supply of preachers from Christendom for all the nations of the heathen world, now and for ages to come; and as they should not be, if our object be to imitate the apostles by throwing the great amount of permanent labor upon converted natives, and introducing what the Holy Spirit may be expected to make a self-sustaining, self-propagating Christianity?

The plan suggested would involve a seminary of a higher order in each considerable mission, which would receive pupils from the preparatory schools, and conduct them through a course of liberal education more or less protracted. These seminaries should be commenced on a small scale, and enlarged no faster than shall be necessary. They should combine the college and the school of theology. The notion that instruction in the principles of human science must precede the study of theology, is derived from the schools of philosophy, and is not countenanced by the word of God. The plain, simple theology of the Scriptures can be taught to youth, and even to heathen youth, in every stage of their education. The institutions should be eminently missionary institutions. The whole course of education, from beginning to end, should be christian. It should be no part of the object of these seminaries to educate natives for the law, nor for medicine, nor for civil affairs, nor for trade, except so far as this will directly promote the legitimate objects of the missions with which they are connected. The course of instruction should be planned with a view to raising up, through the blessing of God, an efficient body of native helpers in the several departments of missionary labor—to be teachers of schools, catechists, tutors and professors in the seminaries, and, above all, preachers of the gospel, pastors of the native churches, and missionaries to the neighboring heathen districts and countries. For this purpose the seminaries should be furnished with competent teachers, and with all necessary books and apparatus, and a press should generally be in their neighborhood.*

* See a Statement of Principles, on which missionary Seminaries

These missionary seminaries will be as really subordinate to the preaching of the gospel, as are the theological seminaries of our own country. If we teach in them, and in so doing turn aside in any degree from the formal ministry of the word, it will be that we may multiply teachers and ministers of the word. Our object will be the more effectually to plant those instrumentalities, which, with God's blessing, will secure for the gospel a permanent footing and constant increase in heathen countries.

Our protracted discussion now draws to its conclusion. We should not forget, however, to glance at the claims of education among the oriental churches. The oriental churches are the Coptic, Syriac, Greek and Armenian, and they number about six millions of souls. The Copts are found in Egypt; the Syrians, in Syria, Mesopotamia, the mountains of Koordistan, and on the western shore of Hindoostan; the Greeks, in Greece, European Turkey and Asia Minor. Many of the Arabs in Syria are of the Greek church; and so is the Georgian nation, living at the northern base of Mount Caucasus, between the Black and Caspian Seas. The country of the Armenians lies between Asia Minor and Persia, but the Armenians are a commercial people widely scattered. About a hundred thousand Maronites on Mount Lebanon, and nine thousand for each of the sects above mentioned, are converts to papacy. These are relics of the churches planted by the apostles. To them were first given the oracles of God, and from them emanated the light of the glorious gospel which shines upon us. "But in treading over again the tracks of the apostles," says the Rev. Mr. Smith, "I have sought in vain for an individual that now breathes the spirit of Jesus, unless he had borrowed it from a foreign source."* I shall content myself with affirming, that the state of education and intelligence is much lower now, in the countries where the oriental churches are found, than it was in the apostolical times. Even if it were not, regarding education as taking the place of miraculous gifts, and as our only means of raising up teachers and preachers, it is to be numbered among the legitimate objects of modern missions to these churches. The necessity for schools sustained by missionary

should be reared, in the Appendix to the 28th (last) Annual Report of the A. B. C. F. Missions, p. 151—155.

* *Missionary Sermons and Addresses*, p. 223.

societies, is, however, less urgent among the oriental Christians, than in heathen nations; and recent indications encourage the belief, that we may pretty easily and without great expense "provoke" those churches to do far more than they are now doing in the way of self-instruction.

Thus the case stands. Apostolical usage has been urged upon us to exclude the use of education from our missions, only because the immense difference in our circumstances has been overlooked. It has been forgotten that their missions were to the most civilized nations of the world, and that ours (I speak not only of those to pagans) are to the least civilized; that theirs were to a people comparatively educated and refined, and ours are to a people uneducated, and to a great extent barbarian, and even savage; that miraculous gifts were conferred by the Holy Ghost upon their gentile converts, so that the churches might be promptly and effectually supplied with pastors and teachers, while notwithstanding the present intellectual degradation of heathen nations, Infinite Wisdom no longer sees it best to bestow such gifts. Thus far the comparison is against us; but now the tables turn. We have a knowledge of the world such as they had not; facilities for travelling far exceeding theirs; paper, printing-presses, printed books, where they had only the papyrus, parchment, the written page, and the voluminous and costly manuscript. In these circumstances, so diverse from those of the apostles, why demand of us that we use no means for publishing the gospel except what they used? Are not means and opportunities talents to be employed—providential gifts bestowed upon us with special reference to the advancement of God's kingdom of grace on earth? Why, when the Head of the church bids *us* go into all the world, and has provided for *us* rail-roads, and steam-boats, and the thousand improvements in modern navigation, should we go on foot, or venture out to sea, without compass, or quadrant, in some "ship of Alexandria?" Why, when he bids *us* make known the gospel to every creature, should we depend only on the living voice and the manuscript? Why should we not avail ourselves of the progress of mind, of art, of science? Is it said, that means are nothing in themselves, that the power which must accomplish the work is of God, and that an extended array of instrumentalities has a tendency to make *us* rely on them and forget his power? This is all true. But did Paul do less because his planting was rather by itself, and God must give

the increase? Did he not exert all his strength, and plant and water, and become all things to all men, and put into requisition every possible means to save them? Unquestionably he did; and so should we. Creation, education, grace, and providence go to make up the degree of our accountability. Still it is a precious truth, that we are no less dependent on the influences of the Holy Spirit, than the apostles were. None of our plans will succeed, none of our efforts prosper, without his influences. Go where we will, if the Holy Spirit go not with us, our missions, however vigorously prosecuted, will fail. Missionaries and their directors and patrons have not felt this dependence enough. There is no danger of feeling it too much. When weak in ourselves, we are strong in God. But faith is not the only grace we are to exercise. We must practise obedience. We must act, as well as believe. Looking unto Jesus, we must do with our might whatsoever our hand findeth to do, for the honor of his name and the advancement of his cause on earth.

ARTICLE VI.

REASONS FOR THE STUDY OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.*

By B. B. Edwards, Professor of Hebrew, Theological Seminary, Andover.

THE Sixth Article of the Constitution of this Seminary prescribes, that under the head of Sacred Literature shall be included "Lectures on the formation, preservation and transmission of the sacred volume; on the languages in which the Bible was originally written; on the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and on the peculiarities of the language and style of the New Testament, resulting from this version and other causes; on the history, character, use, and authority of the versions and manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments; on the canons of biblical criticism; on the authority of the several books of the sacred code; on the apocryphal books of both Testaments, on modern translations of the Bible, more par-

* This Article was delivered by the writer as an Inaugural Address, January 18, 1838, in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary. It is now published in compliance with the wishes of some persons who heard it.

ticularly on the history and character of our English version ; and also critical lectures on the various readings and difficult passages in the sacred writings."

This may justly be regarded as a comprehensive and well-condensed statement of the main points in a course of sacred literature. It may, possibly, be considered as an uncommonly liberal outline, if we take into account the period in which it was framed. It would have received, however, the cordial subscription of the earliest planters of New England.

John Cotton, the first minister of Boston, was able to converse in Hebrew.* Of Samuel Whiting of Lynn, it was said, "that he was especially accurate in Hebrew, in which primitive and expressive language he took great delight." Of the very first settlers of Massachusetts Bay, not less than twenty had been educated at the English universities. The appointed course of studies in Harvard college, at its origin, embraced Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac.† Mr. Dunster, the first president, was understood to have been well acquainted with the oriental languages.‡ Mr. Chauncy, his successor, was admirably skilled in the learned languages, particularly the oriental. In his acquisition of the Hebrew he derived no small benefit, during the space of a year, from the conversation of a Jew. He was the friend of archbishop Usher, and had been, successively, professor of Hebrew and of Greek, at the university of Cambridge, England. When he attended prayers in the hall at

* "Wherein this is not unworthy the taking notice of; that when the poser came to examine him in the Hebrew tongue, the place that he took trial of him by was that Isaiah 3, against the excessive bravery of the haughty daughters of Zion; which hath more hard words in it, than any place of the Bible within so short a compass; and therefore, though a present construction and resolution thereof might have put a good Hebrician to a stand, yet such was his dexterity, as made those difficult words facil, and rendered him a prompt respondent."—*Life of Cotton by John Norton.*

† "The fifth day reads Hebrew, and the Easterne Tongues. Grammar to the first yeare, houre the 8th. To the 2d, Chaldee, at the 9th. houre. To the 3d, Syriack at the 10th houre. Afternoone. The first yeare practise in the Bible at the 2d houre. The 2d, in Ezra and Daniel, at the 3d houre. The 3d, at the 4th houre, in Trostius New Testament."—*New England's First Fruits, London, 1643.*

‡ It was on this account, probably, that he was employed to "revise and publish, the Bay Psalm Book," printed at Cambridge, in 1640.

Harvard college, in the morning, he usually expounded a chapter of the Old Testament, which was first read from Hebrew by one of his pupils; and in the evening, a chapter of the New Testament, read from the Greek. Thomas Thacher, the first minister of the old South Church, Boston, having spent several years under the tuition of president Chauncy, while the latter was minister of Scituate, became well-skilled in Arabic, Syriac and Hebrew; in the last named language, he composed a lexicon.* The thesis, which Cotton Mather maintained, when he received his second degree was "the divine origin of the Hebrew points," though he afterwards saw reason to change his mind, and to hold to the contrary opinion to the last. During seven years after his graduation, he prepared students for admission to college, hearing recitations every day in the original Scriptures, giving particular attention to the Hebrew.

In the burying-ground in the town of Northborough, in this State, there is a monument, on which the following is the inscription in part:

"A native branch of Judah seen,
Which once from off its olive broke,
Regrafted from the living tree,
Of the reviving sap partook."

This "native branch" was Judah Monis, the first regular instructor of Hebrew at Harvard college. He was by birth and religion a Jew, but embraced the christian faith, and was publicly baptised at Cambridge in 1722. The Rev. Dr. Benjamin Colman of Boston preached a sermon on the occasion which was published. In the preface, he remarks, that "Mr. Monis is a master and critic in the Hebrew. He reads, speaks, writes and interprets it with great readiness and accuracy, and is truly *διδασκικός* apt to teach. His diligence and industry, together with his ability, are known unto many, who have seen his grammar and Nomenclator Hebrew and English, as also his translation of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, and the Assembly's Shorter Catechism into Hebrew."† For his Hebrew

* Wisner's Hist. of the Old South Church, p. 12.

† It was voted by the corporation, April 30, 1722, "that Mr. Judah Monis be *improved* as an instructor in the Hebrew language in the

grammar the corporation paid him £35. He made use of the vowel points in this grammar, and insisted that they were essential to the right pronunciation of the language. He resigned his office in 1761. On the 7th of September, in the same year, the corporation voted, "that Sir Sewall be the Hebrew instructor in Harvard College this year." He was re-chosen in 1762 and 1763. In 1764, the Hancock Professorship of the Hebrew and other Oriental Languages was established, from a legacy of Thomas Hancock, an opulent merchant of Boston, who died August 1, 1764. This was the first professorship founded in America by a native. Stephen Sewall was elected the first professor on this foundation. His qualifications for the office were so preëminent, that he was probably the only one who was thought of to fill it. Besides his instructions in Hebrew and Chaldee, he was required to teach in a more private way, such students as should desire it, in the Samaritan, the Syriac and the Arabic. No American, previously, had acquired so extensive an acquaintance with eastern learning as Professor Sewall. His Greek odes were praised by the English reviewers. He corresponded with Kennicott and other learned foreign orientalists. He prepared a Greek Prosody and Lexicon, a Hebrew grammar, a Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, (now in Ms. in the library of Harvard University), and pushed his studies into the Ethiopic and Persian.

President Stiles speaks of Dr. Cutler, the second rector of Yale College, as a "great Hebrician and orientalist." The vehement literary ardor of Dr. Stiles himself is well known. He would actually compass sea and land to get the sight of a Jewish rabbi or a piece of vellum. In May, 1767, says his biographer, Dr. Holmes, he commenced the study of the Hebrew. In the first five days, he read the Psalms. In one month, he translated all the Psalms from Hebrew into Latin. In 1768, he commenced Arabic, Syriac, Chaldee, and Rabbinic. In 1769, he copied an Arabic volume, and translated it from the original. He then, as he terms it, "dipped into Persian and Coptic."

college," and that his salary for one year should be £70. All the undergraduates, except the freshmen and such others as should be exempted by the faculty, were required to attend his instructions on four days in the week. He was re-chosen in 1723, and in 1724. He then appears to have become a permanent instructor. See Worcester Magazine, II. 180, and Peirce's Hist. of Harvard University, p. 232.

During the latter part of the last century, however, the interest in oriental literature had greatly declined. The study of Hebrew was not, indeed, entirely neglected in the colleges which more recently came into existence. Professor John Smith of Dartmouth College gave instruction in Hebrew and compiled a grammar of the language.

The knowledge of eastern learning, possessed by the fathers of New England, was doubtless, in some instances, curious and ill-digested, possibly, superficial, rather than profound and practical. When we take into account, however, the ruggedness of the times, the pressure of other and indispensable duties, and the very imperfect lexical and grammatical helps, we cannot but be astonished, that so much progress was made. More attention, comparatively, was bestowed on the study of Hebrew during the first fifty years after the settlement of New England, than has been given to it at any subsequent period, not excepting the present century. No generation of biblical students has arisen in England, which can be compared to the Ushers, the Seldens, the Lightfoots, the Pococks, the Castells and the Waltons of the middle of the seventeenth century. Dr. Lightfoot gave his invaluable oriental library to Harvard College. The flame of sacred learning which rose high in their Trinity and Immanuel, was rekindled on our wintry shores and amid our unbroken forests. Our fathers did not avail themselves of the common excuse—want of time—for the neglect of the study in question. One of these venerable men, who had read himself blind, and who was accustomed to derive consolation from the thought, that his eyes would be opened at the resurrection of the just, performed the duties of a laborious parish minister, in a new settlement, and also of a teacher of youth. Another individual, who was the pastor of an English church, a preacher to several native congregations, and the creator of an Indian language, did not lack time to pursue his Hebrew studies.

But it is not my intention to dwell on these interesting facts in the early records of New England. Before proceeding to the main purpose of this address, I wished to fortify myself with good examples, and to show that ancient precedents were in my favor.

I shall attempt, in the ensuing remarks, to adduce some reasons why the study of the Hebrew language should be made a part of a liberal education, and be put into the same category with Latin and Greek. There is no adequate cause for con-

fining the study to a small part of one of the professions. Why should it not be considered as the common privilege of all the professions? I know of but one argument against its introduction into our present courses of collegiate study;—they are already pre-occupied and crowded with other branches of learning. Were one or two additional years, however, allowed to the preparatory schools; were the elements of Latin and Greek thoroughly mastered at our academies, as they ought to be, and as they are at two or three of them, an opening might be found somewhere in the four college years for the histories of Moses and for the songs of David. No considerate man would dislodge the Latin and Greek classics from the place which they now occupy. Still, Isaiah is, in all respects—in simplicity, in fire, in originality, in sublimity—as worthy of study as Homer. The Lamentations of Jeremiah will not yield to the Elegies of Tyrtæus. These things ought to be done, while the other should not be left undone.

1. An argument for the study of Hebrew may be derived from the fact, that great eminence in the pursuit, on the part of a few individuals, cannot be expected in the absence of a general cultivation of the language.

It has been argued, that we need a few men well-skilled in the original Scriptures to serve as defenders of the faith when attacked on critical grounds, while the great body of the clergy and of the educated laity may safely neglect or but imperfectly acquire the branch of knowledge in question. That this general position is untenable, it were perfectly easy to demonstrate. Of the ten thousand, or twelve thousand ministers of Christ in the United States, more than ten, or fifty, or one hundred, or one thousand ought to be intimately conversant with the original documents of their faith. Allowing, however, that a few men, well trained as original investigators would meet the exigency, still we contend, that this small number could not be raised up amidst a surrounding ignorance, or a general apathy, in relation to the pursuit. No one acquainted with the history of the world, or with the nature of man, can entertain an expectation so fallacious.

Why is England destitute, and why has she always been destitute, of great masters in music? Because her people have no taste for it. It is not taught in her schools. There is no chord running through her bustling population, which a mighty minstrel, rising up, could touch. It is the flight of the shuttle

and the stroke of the hammer for which England has ears,—none for the charming symphony that wakens raptures high. Why has Germany produced Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Weber, and nearly all the other distinguished original composers of music? Because these men could be understood and relished all over Germany. Every peasant is a singer; every family is an orchestra. Her entire population is impregnated with the spirit of song. It is considered to be no more difficult nor remarkable to read and write music in the schools, than it is to read and write language. This universal diffusion of the musical taste does not cramp genius, or prevent the rise of great men; on the contrary, it enlivens genius, and creates masters who become the teachers of Christendom.*

Why has France been eminent above other nations for mathematical development, so that we can hardly count up her Clairauts, Lalandes, Laplaces, Lagranges, Biots, Aragos? Because mathematics have been highly honored by sovereign and by people, not merely in the practical applications, but in the most abstract analyses. Her scientific men have not risen up alone, like a single cedar on the sides of Lebanon. Multitudes of young men, educated in her schools and sent forth in her armies, have been eminent mathematicians.

Sacred literature holds out like examples. England, in the seventeenth century, had a constellation of profound linguists. Learned travellers were despatched to the East; manuscripts and books were collected; oriental professorships were founded; archbishops laid out their revenues in buying coins. Cromwell, "who chose men for places and not places for men," opened his republican chest. Translations, collations, and gigantic polyglotts were the result. While the general interest continued, eminent scholars were not wanting.

Thus it is in Germany. Her biblical scholars, who are

* "I always loved music; whoso hath skill in this art, the same is of good kind, fitted for all things; we must of necessity maintain music in schools; a schoolmaster ought to have skill in music; otherwise, I would not regard him, neither should we ordain young fellows to the office of preaching, except they have been before well exercised and practised in the school of music. Music is a fair gift of God, and near allied to divinity. I would not for a great matter be destitute of the small skill in music which I have. The youth ought to be brought up and accustomed to this art, for it maketh fine and expert people."—*Luther's Table Talk*, London, 1652, p. 500.

known the world over, did not rise up isolated, without sympathy or encouragement. All the middle and most of the north of Europe were spectators or competitors. Hosts of ardent scholars were pressing on behind them. They were borne upward by an impulse which they could not resist. Outward things combined with the inward resolution and contributed materially to the result.

It is not denied that there are apparent exceptions to this position. It has been strenuously argued, that a state of semi-barbarism is the most favorable for eminence in some of the fine arts, particularly in poetry. David, it has been said, reached by one bound, the highest place in lyric composition. Homer flourished when the Greeks lived in caves and fed on acorns. Yet these are not to be viewed altogether as exceptions. The people who had in their remembrance such strains as the sister of Moses sang at the Red sea, such words as Moses himself delivered on the plains of Moab, such triumphal songs as that of Deborah, by the brook Kishon, could not but furnish many minds kindred to that of David. And it is not certain but that Homer has collected the spoils of a thousand preceding or contemporary bards, whose names have faded away partly in the accidents of time, and not merely through his own transcendent effulgence.

In every department of labor, men are made for each other. They need the cheering sympathy and the generous coöperation of fellow-laborers. Were there none to share the pleasures of success, one half of its value would be wanting. A modest man does not wish to acquire languages, that he may be stared at as the eighth wonder of the world. Ordinarily he will have no heart to labor, unless he is surrounded by a community who can properly estimate his productions. What motive has he to push his researches far beyond the point where they would be generally appreciated? What security, moreover, has the church, that he will not involve himself with them in errors and absurdities? He needs around him the safeguard of a vigilant, as well as the support of a sympathizing community.

2. My second argument for the more general study of the Hebrew is, that we may be better prepared to take all proper advantage of the immense stores of erudition on the general subject which have been collected in Germany.

Nothing is more common, and nothing is more unfounded, than national prejudice. The name of a Frenchman with some

persons, is a synonym for the want of all sound and sober learning. With others, the common sense and the practical talent of the Englishman are worth all the world besides. Not a few extol Germany as the great centre of civilization—while her neighbors are groping in twilight. On the other hand, multitudes can see nothing there but cloudy metaphysics and learned atheism. But the truth is not contained in these omnivorous generalizations. The spirit of the gospel requires us to judge of nations with the same candor and generous discrimination which we should exercise towards individual men. A liberal education fails in one of its most precious fruits, if it does not lead the scholar to estimate every part of the earth in some such manner as we might suppose a pure-minded inhabitant of another world does. God has set one nation over against another, as he has the organs of the human body, that there might be mutual dependence and coöperation. His national gifts are not to be idolatrously magnified, nor to be sullenly set at nought. France needs the English steadiness and the English wisdom. England might condescend to look over the channel for mathematical and medical science. In the fields of literature, the Germans are unsurpassed. As intellectual explorers, they rise up by thousands. They have hardiness of body, iron resolution, patience, a sustaining enthusiasm, a spirit of vigorous competition, a high hereditary character to be maintained, and a learned and munificent government. In the department of sacred philology, their researches have been extensive and profound and the results abundant. The Hebrew and its cognate dialects, they have subjected to searching and discriminating examinations. Grammars and lexicons, introductions, commentaries, geographical treatises, elaborate essays on particular topics, and an almost infinite number of miscellaneous compositions attest their wonderful diligence. But these immense treasures, in order fully to meet the wants of our community, require selection and arrangement—not simply a transfusion into our language, but an adaptation to our modes of thinking, to our taste and methods in illustration, to our theological tendencies, and to our general spirit. For many of their peculiarities as a theorizing and unpractical race, the Germans are not in fault. Not a few of the channels of activity are closed up against them, by their government, which may be called a good, paternal despotism. In numerous cases, the productions of the German press demand emendation, and puri-

fication, if not an entire remodelling. We are not called upon to augment the stores of English infidelity. The products of the neological school may be left, as a general thing, to perish on the ground which gave them birth. The writings of some of the principal evangelical theologians of Germany have not, by any means, all the value which their ardent admirers attributed to them on their first introduction to our community. Schleiermacher, whose life is regarded as an era in Germany, seemed to have been long struggling to attain what he might have found by opening the pages of our Dr. Bellamy. The notions which are generally entertained on the continent of Europe in respect to the observance of the Sabbath, we should not wish to have transplanted here.

With these exceptions, however, the Germans possess mines of inestimable wealth, which ought to be opened for the benefit of the world. They are now, comparatively, unworked or unknown. The social and political circumstances of the German States are such as not to admit of the employment and diffusion of their stores of learning in a thousand ways accessible to those who speak the English tongue. A large part, however, of their biblical labors are unappreciable by us. To use a favorite term of theirs, we have not reached the point of development. We are not able to grapple with their learning, nor sympathize with their spirit. Innumerable treatises, bearing on important points in the interpretation of the Old Testament, remain solitary copies in two or three of our libraries, because English versions of them could not be sold. Some of these essays would be of essential aid to all those foreign missionaries who are called to the office of translating the Scriptures.

Moreover, it seems to be the especial duty of the scholars of this country to give to the treatises in question currency in the English tongue. The few individuals in Great Britain, who have the ability and the inclination to engage in these pursuits, are almost wholly withdrawn to the vindication of their political and ecclesiastical rights. Few results, comparatively, can be expected in that country, till the civil storms are blown over, or till the exclusive regard to what is immediately practical shall give place to juster views.

3. The importance of the study of the Hebrew language may be argued from its effect in strengthening the faith of the student in the genuineness and divine authority of the Scriptures.

The Roman Catholic binds up certain apocryphal books

with the Old Testament. But it would seem hardly possible for a reader of common discernment not to perceive instantly that the claims of these books to inspiration rest on a very precarious basis. To render this obvious, they need only to be read in connection with the canonical books. These latter have the unstudied guilelessness, the transparency, the uniform dignity of divine truth ; the former may have traces of proceeding from honest and pious minds, but the dignity is not sustained ; the simplicity is an imitation ; they contain, not unfrequently, jejune repetitions and puerilities. Their inferiority is rendered more striking by their position. Tobit would be a respectable story if it were not crowded in between Malachi and Matthew. But placed where it is, it is brought into most unfortunate proximity with the writings whose purity, decorum and consistency indicate their higher origin. Thus our confidence in the divinity of God's word is materially strengthened. It arises in part from feeling. We cannot describe the process. Before we are aware, the perception of the difference between the two classes of writing has become a part of our consciousness.

But if such is the effect in comparing the apocryphal books with our excellent English version of the Old Testament, the contrast is much heightened by examining the former in connection with the original of the latter. The Hebrew has the signatures of a simplicity and a freshness, which no translation can fully copy, unless it be itself inspired. It is the freshness of Eden on the seventh morning of the creation ; it is the simplicity of patriarchs and prophets ; it is the innocent guilelessness of angels. Our translation is faithful to the sense of the original, and it will be an everlasting monument of the powers of the English language, especially in its Anglo-Saxon features. But it is no disparagement to the version to assert, that it does not give us all the vitality and beauty of the original. In reading the latter, we cannot but feel, that we have passed into the holy of holies ; the proofs of divinity are thick around us. We do not simply *know* that our faith in these records is firm, we *feel* that it is.

We may arrive at the same conclusion in another way. The translator must, in many cases, select *one* word, the best which he can find, to express the sense of the original word. He cannot employ amplification, paraphrase, circumlocution. He must take a single substantive, or a single epithet ; else he weakens, or obscures the passage. He very properly renders

the verb דָּבַר by its fifth signification, *to speak*. He cannot even allude to the other, and more primary meanings—to arrange, to guide, to follow, and to lie in wait. He rightly translates the noun דֶּרֶךְ by *path* or *road*, without even hinting that it has also the meaning of act of going, journey, mode of living, conduct towards God and man, religion, destiny or the way in which it goes with any one. Thus with many other terms which might be mentioned. The sight of the original word will suggest to the reader, not simply the substantial signification of it in the passage, but all the related significations near or remote. At a single glance, he has the history of the word—not to confuse his conceptions, but to enlarge them and render them more vivid. A single word in the translation expresses the idea of the original substantially. But to unfold the sense in the various shades of it, in the utmost perfection, the etymology of the word is, perhaps, required, or the signification is partly contained in some other ramification from the root. Thus there will be a *vivid* apprehension of the passage. The characters of the revelation will stand out in bolder relief. The student will feel that he is no longer dealing with shadows; what he especially needs he will gain—not faith in its lower forms, but a living and enduring impression of the great realities which are couched beneath the terms which are daily coming under his eye.

He will, also, attain to a more intelligent conviction of the truth of some particular facts or doctrines. We may select, for instance, that of the original unity of the human race. It seems now to be fully proved, that one speech, substantially so called, pervaded a considerable portion of Europe and Asia and united in a bond of union, nations professing the most irreconcilable religions, with the most dissimilar institutions, and bearing but a slight resemblance in physiognomy and color. This language or family of languages, is the Indo-Germanic, or Indo-European. By further researches, it appears to be established, that this family is connected with the Semitic, of which the Hebrew is a dialect, not by a few verbal coincidences, but linked together, both by points of actual contact, and by the interposition of the Coptic, grounded on the essential structure and most necessary forms of the three.* In the common Hebrew Lexicon, now used in this institution, whole families of

* Dr. Wiseman's Lectures, p. 66.

biliteral roots are illustrated by analogies from the Indo-Germanic tongues, proving that the Hebrew in its primary elements, approaches much nearer both to the European and the Southern Asiatic languages, than has been generally supposed. Every investigation in this field, and it is one of boundless extent and but just opened, increases the credibility of the Mosaic history of the creation of man, and helps to confute a standing cavil of infidelity, arising from the existing diversities in the language, color, and physical organization of our race. The diligent student of the original Scriptures will be constantly meeting with unexpected and interesting discoveries, which will afford him a satisfaction akin to that felt on the solving of some long studied mathematical problem.

We have not space to illustrate the local evidence furnished by the Hebrew language, in the successive stages of its history, of the honesty of the sacred historians. When the Israelites were in Egypt, Egyptian words were incorporated with the language. There was a strong infusion of Chaldeisms, when the people were in Babylon. Some of the later books contain words of Persian origin. Thus the language is a standing memorial of the general truth of the history.

But we hasten to consider ;

4. The influence of the study of the Hebrew Scriptures on the imagination and the taste.

The imagination is not a modification of memory or of any other mental faculty. It is an original quality of the mind. It has the power of conferring additional properties upon an object, or of abstracting from it some of those which it actually possesses, and of thus enabling the object to react, like a new substance, upon the mind which has performed the process. It has also the power of shaping and of creating by innumerable methods. It consolidates numbers into unity and separates unity into numbers.* "It draws all things to one—makes things animate and inanimate, beings with their attributes, subjects and their accessories take one color, and serve to one effect."† In its highest or creative power, the imagination belongs only to the few great poets. But the faculty is, doubtless, possessed by all men, though, in some cases, it is faintly,

* See these ideas beautifully expanded and illustrated in the Prefaces to Wordsworth's Poetry, Boston edition, 1824.

† Charles Lamb, on the Genius and Character of Hogarth, Works, Vol. II. p. 391. New York edition.

or not at all developed. Whoever can read with intelligence and sympathy a genuine poet has imagination.

“The grand storehouses of enthusiastic and meditative imagination, as distinguished from human and dramatic imagination,” remarks a great living writer, “are the prophetic and lyrical parts of the Holy Scriptures, and the works of Milton, to which I cannot forbear to add those of Spenser. I select these writers in preference to those of Greece and Rome, because the anthropomorphism of the pagan religion subjected the minds of the greatest poets in those countries too much to the bondage of form, from which the Hebrews were preserved by their abhorrence of idolatry. This abhorrence was almost as strong in our great epic poet, both from the circumstances of his life, and from the constitution of his mind. However imbued the surface might be with classical literature, he was a Hebrew in soul, and all things in him tended towards the sublime.”

The poetry of the Hebrews is sometimes represented as oriental, an eastern fashion, local, factitious, artificial, adapted to men living a migratory life, under an ardent sky, and not adapted to a severe European taste. But the Hebrew poetry is no such thing. It is European; it is occidental, for all ages and generations; it is universal in its character; it is everlasting as the affections of man. It furnishes food for that imagination, whose birth was not for time but for all eternity. Peasants can feel its force; philosophers kindle at its inspiration. Strip the Old Testament of its poetry, and it is not the old Testament; it contains truth, but not the truth which God revealed. Take out of it the element of imagination, that which makes it poetry, and the residue is neither poetry nor prose. It may be truth, but it is not the truth which we need. No error can be greater than to call the Hebrew poetry mere costume. There are some truths which are poetry in their very nature. Men, the world over, have imagination and love poetic truths, and these truths were necessary for them, and, therefore, part of the Bible is poetry.

The Arab praises the Koran because it contains lofty, poetic conceptions of the Deity; but these are the very things which Mohammed stole from the Jewish Scriptures.

It has been, sometimes, a matter of wonder how the poet Dante,—rising up when the human mind was at its nadir, alone, in the night of the dark ages, in Italy, in the confluence, as it were, of the two streams of corruption and death, in the midst

of petty disputes, raging civil discords, when men were burnt to death for astrology—how he could pour forth numbers so sublime, and at once take a position higher than that attained, with two or three exceptions, by uninspired poets.* But the answer is, that Dante had read Moses' description of Eden and of the fall. His imagination had been fed with the visions of Ezekiel and of the Apocalypse.

The highest, the grand characteristic of Hebrew poetry is, that it furnishes the *germs* of innumerable thoughts, hints, obscure intimations, recondite allusions, almost hidden gleams of imagination, out of which a great poet will erect an ode or an epic. Isaiah had said that "Lucifer sate upon the mount of the congregation on the sides of the north." This was enough for Milton. From this scarcely intelligible hint, the poet threw up a palace for his fallen angel thus :

At length into the limits of the north
They came, and Satan to his royal seat,
High on a hill, far blazing, as a mount
Raised on a mount, with pyramids and towers,
From diamond quarries hewn, and rocks of gold.
The palace of great Lucifer, so call
That structure in the dialect of men
Interpreted ; which not long after he
Affecting all equality with God,
In imitation of that mount, whereon
Messiah was declared in sight of Heaven,
The mountain of the congregation called, etc.†

It is these almost concealed gleams of imagination, where a common eye would see nothing, and a common imagination would remain unaffected,—seeds of the loftiest thoughts, germs of the highest poetry,—which the Bible contains more than all other books, that has fixed the eye, and kindled the conceptions of the great masters of the pencil. How many sublime paintings have been suggested by the Apocalypse, itself essentially a piece of Hebrew poetry !

Besides, much of the Hebrew poetry is addressed to the imagination in its most poetic, in its creative sense. It supplies something other than hints. It has regular and sustained pieces of composition in which imagination is the predominant element, just as it is in the first two books of *Paradise Lost*.

* North American Review, Oct. 1833.

† Mitford's *Life of Milton*, I. p. 78.

Such are the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Isaiah, the introductory vision of Ezekiel and the entire book of Nahum. The capricious, the fanciful, the temporary are excluded. The metaphors are indefinite in extent, yet true to nature. They are not to be judged by the rigor of logic or of mathematics; but they have a science of their own, from whose rules they never deviate. The reader who is not aware of this prevailing element in these compositions, and who cannot bring some portion of the same element to their illustration, will not see all their beauty nor feel all their force.

Unaffected pathos is another characteristic of Hebrew poetry.

It is a singular fact, that among the almost innumerable commentaries which Germany has poured forth on the various books of the Old Testament, the writings of Jeremiah have been generally passed by. We hardly know of a good critical commentary on it in any language. Isaiah receives all the commendation, sometimes at the expense of great literary injustice to Jeremiah.* But for true, poetic sensibility, Jeremiah is unsurpassed. A tender and plaintive melancholy, untinged by the least bitterness or misanthropy, is diffused through his writings. In the midst of an earnest remonstrance, or an historical narrative, we unexpectedly meet with a stroke of pathos, which, it would seem, he could not restrain till he had completed the composition. Coming upon us, as it does, while we are listening to the recital of the idolatries and horrible cruelties of his ungrateful countrymen, it is like the tones of a human voice to a solitary traveller on a sandy and savage desert. The Lamentations are an exhibition of patriotism, confidence in God, artless and overwhelming grief, bold apostrophe, delicate personal allusions and generous enthusiasm, which has no parallel. It is not Brutus at Philippi, nor Marius on the ruins of Carthage, but it is a venerable prophet of the Lord treading on the ashes of the holy city and on the bones of the daughters of Zion.

In offering these remarks on the universal and imperishable character of Hebrew poetry, we do not intend to deny, that there are orientalisms, an eastern costume, modes of speaking and figures of speech which are peculiar to the East. The images of the orientals are bolder and more fiery than ours. We are accustomed to compare man to the various objects of nature; they liken external objects to man, and make all nature instinct

* See Gesenius's Commentary on Isaiah, in many places.

with life. With them science is the mother of virtue, precipitation is the mother of repentance, the soldier is the son of war, the traveller is the son of the road, words are the daughters of the lips, and prudence is the daughter of reflection. Every thing, even down to a letter of introduction, or to the firman of the Sultan, must be in a poetic form.

In the consideration of these subordinate matters, the western student must exercise his taste, or that acquired power which judges of the fitness or congruity of objects. As a reader or interpreter of the Old Testament original, he will have full scope for the exercise both of his imagination and his taste. No ampler or richer field for their development or cultivation could be desired.

Such cultivation and development, moreover, are needed by the youthful evangelical clergymen of our country. In their anxiety to become sound theologians, or skilful logicians, or in the pressure of practical duties, they have too much neglected the province of imagination and taste. In this respect the two denominations more particularly connected with this institution are, unquestionably, inferior to some other denominations of Christians. Consequently, in not a few excellent men, there has been an inability to appreciate and employ all the treasures which are accumulated in God's word. They have not availed themselves of that cultivation of the taste and of the imagination which may be acquired by faithfully studying such compositions as those of David and of Isaiah. There exists, in our community, a class of highly disciplined minds that evangelical clergymen have not been able, in general, to reach. Intellect has not been wanting; nor theology nor piety, but there has been a deficiency in those graces of style, and in that highly cultivated taste which are required to meet the exigencies of the higher circles in society. No man of sense would argue for what are sometimes called tasteful or imaginative preachers. Yet, as the powers of imagination are one of the noblest gifts of God, as their exercise is entirely consistent with a sober judgment and with sound common sense, and as a leading class in the community will not be affected by the truths of the gospel, unless they are presented in acceptable words and enforced in good taste, we are certainly under the highest obligations to develop these powers of imagination and of taste and employ them fully in the service of our Lord.

5. Another important consideration is the bearing of the study of Hebrew upon the missionary enterprise.

The one hundred and twenty-two ordained missionaries sent out by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, sixty-nine of whom were educated at this institution, have published, with the aid of their assistants, between fifty and sixty millions of pages, a large proportion of which are parts of the Scriptures. The number of languages employed is twenty-nine, nine of which were first reduced to writing by these missionaries. In all this wide department of labor, augmenting every year, an accurate acquaintance with the original Hebrew is, of course, indispensable. The missionary translator is not to repair to the Vulgate, nor to the Septuagint, but to the fountain head.

In the labors which are to be entered into for the conversion of the five or six millions of Jews, scattered over the world, the necessity of the Hebrew Bible is too obvious to need the briefest allusion. In respect to familiarity with its pages, the missionary himself must become a Jew.

The bearings of the subject upon those who speak the Arabic tongue may justify a moment's consideration. The great problem for the friends of civilization and Christianity to solve is the conversion of the millions who use the Chinese and the Arabic languages. These enlightened and saved, the world, comparatively, is evangelized. Henry Martyn, in speaking of the Arabic translation of the Bible, says: "It will be of more importance than one fourth of all that have ever been made. We can begin to preach to Arabia, Syria, Persia, Tartary, part of India and China, half of Africa, and nearly all the sea coasts of the Mediterranean, including Turkey." According to the tables in the Modern Atlas, this would give upwards of two hundred millions, who would be reached through the Arabic tongue. This calculation may, perhaps, appear extravagant; yet, if we look at the extent of the language, with all its different dialects, the number who use it will fall not far short of one fourth of the population of the globe.* Any thing, therefore,

* The *written* Arabic, or that in which the Koran is composed, was the language of the people inhabiting the vast empire founded by the successors of Mohammed. It is now the religious and literary language of the numerous nations that profess Islamism, extending from the island of Goree in the Atlantic ocean to the eastern extremity of Africa, and from Madagascar to the rivers Oby and Volga in the north of Asia and Europe. The *vulgar* Arabic is spoken in a great part of Syria, in Mesopotamia, in Khusistan and Fars along the Persian Gulf, on the Coromandel and Malabar coasts in India, in all

which will materially aid us in the acquisition of the Arabic has a value which words cannot express.

What, then, are the relations between the Hebrew and the Arabic? Most intimate and fundamental. The Arabs have a common ancestry with the Jews, partly from Abraham through Ishmael, and partly from Heber through his son Joktan. Some of the Arab tribes most clearly spoke the same language with the Israelites, while Moses was leading the latter through the wilderness. At what time there was a divergence, we are not informed. But in numerous and in important points, the two languages yet remain identical.

The affinity of languages is sought by one class of philologists in their *words*; in their *grammar*, by another class. According to the former, words are the matter of language, and grammar its form or fashioning; according to the latter, grammar is an essential, inborn element of a language, so that a new grammar cannot be separately imposed upon a people. But whichever of these methods is adopted, in order to determine the affinity of two languages, the result in the case before us is the same. The Hebrew and Arabic are kindred both in words and in grammar, both lexically and grammatically. In an Arabic translation of the Pentateuch, about one half of the words are Hebrew, with the same radical letters. One writer enumerates more than three hundred names of the most common objects in nature which are the same in both, without by any means exhausting the list. The roots in both languages are generally dissyllabic, lying in the verb rather than in the noun. The two languages abound in guttural sounds. The oblique cases of pronouns are appended to the verb, the noun, and to particles. The verb has but two tenses. The gender is only two-fold. The cases are designated by means of prepositions. The genitive is expressed by a change in the first noun, not in the second. The noun and the verb do not admit of being compounded. There is a certain simplicity in the syntax, and

Egypt, in Nubia along the whole course of the Nile from Egypt to Sennaar, by the Arabs and Moors in all the towns of the Barbary States and by the wandering Bedouins, in a part of Biledulgerid, in Fezzan, in Sahara, in part of the kingdoms of Kordofan, Darfour, and of Bornou Proper, in different States on the coast of Zanguebar, in Socotra, in a great part of Madagascar, in Malta, and in some of the islands of the Indian archipelago. There are various dialects of the vulgar Arabic, but they do not differ greatly from one another. See *Balbi's Atlas Ethnographique du Globe*, Paris, 1826.

the diction is, in the highest degree, unperiodic. In the Hebrew Lexicon which we here daily use, almost every Hebrew root has a corresponding Arabic one, with the same radicals, and generally with the same signification.

In promoting, therefore, the study of Hebrew in this country, we are taking a most direct means to spread the glorious gospel of Christ, not only where the Arabic is the dominant language, but wherever Islamism has penetrated, that is, from Calcutta to Constantinople, and from the Caspian sea to our American colony in Liberia. A thorough knowledge of Hebrew will remove at least one half the difficulty of acquiring the Arabic. It will introduce us to the same modes of writing and of thought, to the same poetic diction, and in part to the same material objects, the same countries—and the same historical associations. In this sense, the Hebrew is not a *dead* language. By its most intimate connection with the Arabic, and, I may add, with the Syriac, it is still spoken at the foot of Mount Ararat, on the site of old Nineveh, at Carthage, in the ancient Berytus, and where Paul was shipwrecked. It is reviving in Egypt, and the Bible and the Tract Societies are spreading its literature on the wings of every wind.

There are two other points upon which, did the time admit, some remarks might be offered, viz. the light which a critical examination of the Hebrew Scriptures might be expected to throw on the systems of christian theology; and on the present increasing tendency in some portions of the church to undervalue the Old Testament and to degrade it from any connection with the New—thus in effect subverting the authority of both; but I forbear.

It is with unfeigned diffidence, and not without fear and trembling, that I enter upon the duties before me. My associations in this place are those of a learner in the presence of venerated teachers both among the living and the dead. The course of study is, indeed, delightful—and fond and ardent hopes might be indulged by one just entering upon it, yet the experience of almost every day warns us that the fairest earthly hopes bloom only for the grave. The work too is one where presumption and ignorance have no place—interpreting the thoughts of Heaven—endeavoring to explain the mind of the Holy Spirit. Yet that Spirit, humbly sought, giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might, increaseth strength.

ARTICLE VII.

INQUIRY RESPECTING THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL, AND THE GENUINENESS OF THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF THE SAME; WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO MR. NORTON'S VIEW OF THESE SUBJECTS AS EXHIBITED IN HIS TREATISE ON THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS.

By M. Stuart, Prof. Sac. Lit. Theol Sem. Andover.

§ 1. *Introductory Remarks.*

MR. NORTON has so connected these two subjects, in his Treatise, that it is difficult to separate the one from the other, and yet preserve a special regard to what he has advanced respecting them. He supposes that the first two chapters of our present Gospel of Matthew are an interpolation. He admits, indeed, that they have always made a part of our *Greek Translation* (as he names it) of Matthew; but he supposes 'the original Hebrew copy of Matthew to have been augmented, by the addition of the chapters in question before it was translated. These chapters,' he thinks, 'may have been a separate document at first; and this being small, and apparently constituting a natural introduction to the Gospel of Matthew, (which originally omitted the genealogy and the history of Jesus' infancy), they were transcribed by some copyist into one or more Mss. of the Hebrew Original, and thus came at length to be blended with it, and to be written in more or less of future copies as belonging to it.' Some one or more of these copies, thus interpolated, came, as he supposes, into the hands of the Greek Translator of Matthew, who gave to this Gospel the form which it now presents; Addit. Notes, p. liii.

In the discussion of the questions before us, I shall begin with that which respects the *language* in which the Gospel of Matthew was originally written, and then make some remarks on the alleged interpolation of the first two chapters.

Mr. Norton, like Campbell, Olshausen, and some other writers, seems to consider the question so clear in respect to the *Hebrew* original of Matthew, that he declines even going into

any extended argument respecting it. He simply refers to several of the Christian fathers, who have expressed an opinion in favour of such an original ; and then adds, that 'as there is no intrinsic improbability against this, we must believe it, unless we reject the testimony of all Christian antiquity.' He moreover alleges, that 'nothing has been objected to this testimony, which he regards as of sufficient force to justify a protracted discussion ;' Add. Notes, p. xlv.

In terms scarcely less confident than these, does Olshausen express himself, in his work on the *Genuineness of the four canonical Gospels*, p. 28. He even goes so far as to say : "We have scarcely a testimony for the existence of Matthew, if we deny that his Gospel was written in Hebrew." All this is said too, by a writer who has laboured abundantly, and much to the purpose also, to shew that Matthew's *Greek* Gospel is quoted from the very earliest times. He even lays it down (p. 93) as incontrovertible, that 'in the time of Papias,' i. e. very little after the close of the first century, '*the Greek translation of Matthew was every where current in the church, and constituted a part of the canonical four Gospels.*'

Another German critic, J. E. C. Schmidt, Professor of Theology, etc., at Giessen, in his *Historico-critical Introduction to the New Testament* (Giessen, 1818), in a style appropriate to a certain class of Neologists in Germany, declares, that 'if we do not admit the *Hebrew* original of Matthew, he knows not how to prove at all that this publican ever wrote a Gospel ;' Pref. p. iv.

If assurance of being in the right could make a cause good, we might regard it, then, as quite beyond the reach of probability, that any doubts which are of serious moment can be raised respecting the views which these authors, and others of the like sentiment, have defended. After all, however, we may with propriety say, that any question ought surely to be made very clear, before critics should venture to assert so categorically as has been done in the present case.

It is not a fact, at any rate, that all who have studied this subject, and written upon it, have come to the same result as the authors just named. If there are critics entitled to high respect, (which I readily concede), on the list of those who have adopted such views as Mr. Norton, yet there are others deserving of equal deference, who are found on an opposite list.

Omitting the ancient writers, we find among modern critics who have declared in favour of a *Hebrew* original, Corrodi, Michaelis, Weber, Bolten, Adler, Storr, Haenlein, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Kuinoel, Schmidt, Harwood, Owen, Campbell, A. Clarke, and Olshausen, authors comparatively recent; also Simon, Mill, Cave, Grotius, Bellarmin, Casaubon, Walton, Tillemont, Elsner, and others, of preceding times. But on the other hand, as being in favour of a *Greek* original, we can appeal to Erasmus, Paraeus, Calvin, Le Clerc, Fabricius, Pfeiffer, Lightfoot, Beausobre, Basnage, Wetstein, Rumpaeus, Hoffman, Leusden, Masch, Vogel, C. F. Schmid, Lardner, Jortin, Hey, Jones, Gabler, Paulus, and others. Besides these, the leading works which have recently been written on the literature of the New Testament, I mean the Introductions of Hug, De Wette, and Schott, defend a *Greek* original.

One would be naturally prone to think, on looking at this second list of names, that something worthy of notice may be or has been said, in favour of an opinion adopted by men of such a cast as these. However, as it is no part of my design to make an appeal to *authorities*, in respect to a question of such a nature as that before us, I shall endeavour to exhibit the real state of *facts* in regard to it, so far as I have been able to form an acquaintance with them.

§ 2. *Testimony of the Christian Fathers.*

First of all, let us attend to *the testimonies of the ancient Christian Fathers, with respect to the language in which the Gospel of Matthew was originally written.* On these, great stress has often been laid; or rather, as I might truly say, the question has been oftentimes assumed as decided, or frequently been declared to be decided beyond the reach of any appeal, by the testimonies which the ancients have bequeathed to us.

The first and most important testimony is that of ΠΑΡΙΑΣ; who was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia of Asia Minor, and flourished at the close of the first century and the beginning of the second. None of his works are now extant, excepting a few fragments preserved in quotations. Eusebius has given a particular account of him, in his Hist. Ecc. III. 39, and Jerome in his Lib. de Viris Illust. c. 18. It appears that he wrote five books, entitled Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἑξηγήσεις, i. e. *explanations or interpretations of divine oracles or sayings.* Irenaeus

(adv. Haeres. V. 33) adverts to these books ; and at the same time he says: Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἐταῖρος γέγονώς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ · i. e. ‘ Papias was a hearer of John, and moreover a friend of Polycarp, a man of primitive times.’

The reader, however, would form, as it seems to me, quite an incorrect opinion respecting Papias, should he make it up merely from this declaration of Irenaeus. Eusebius, who makes this quotation from Irenaeus (ubi supra), immediately adds: “ But Papias himself, in the proem of his book, does not say at all that he was an eye or ear-witness of the apostles, but only that he learned the things which respect the Christian faith from those who were the familiar acquaintances (τῶν γνωρίμων) of the apostles.” The quotations which Eusebius then makes from Papias himself, whose book was before him, seem to me fully to justify his remark which I have just quoted. Papias explicitly says, that he had made it a business to collect together, as much as possible, all the *oral* traditions and sayings to which he could have access, and which were deserving of credit, respecting the declarations of the apostles and other disciples of Christ ; of which latter class, he names Aristion and John the presbyter (ὁ πρεσβύτερος). Papias does not seem to intimate that he himself had access personally to the apostles, and thus made inquiries of them ; he says expressly, that he made his inquiries of *elders who were conversant with apostles*—παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον . . . παρακολουθηκότων τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, i. e. ‘ I learned well of the elders . . . who were conversant with the πρεσβυτέροις,’ which means, in this latter case, *the apostles and primitive disciples*.

I have been thus particular in stating these facts, because they enter essentially into the dispute about the *credit* due to the declarations of Papias which are yet to be cited. On the one hand he has often been represented as an *apostolic* man, i. e. a hearer of the apostles themselves, and we are called upon to give him almost the credit due to an inspired witness ; on the other, vigorous efforts have been made to weaken the force of his testimony, particularly because Eusebius calls him (III. 19), σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν, i. e. *a man of very small talents, or of very little compass of mind*. The statement of Irenaeus above recited, if taken in a limited sense, may, after all, be regarded as correct ; that is, Papias may have heard or seen the apostle John at Ephesus, or in its neighborhood, near the close of this apostle’s life. That Papias was well-acquainted with

Polycarp, there can be no good reason to doubt. But that this author, when his book was written which has been already named, had been conversant with any number of the apostles and had derived his *Ἐξηγήσεις* from their oral testimony, there is not a shadow of evidence to prove; nay, directly the contrary is manifest. He does not even name Polycarp as a source from which he drew; at least this is not done in the passages quoted by Eusebius. Moreover, the place in which he lived and the time when he flourished almost preclude the possibility of his being a *γνώριμος τῶν ἀποστόλων*.

But while we are cautioned by such circumstances as these not to claim too much for Papias, I can not, on the other hand, assent to what Hug and many others have endeavoured to make out, viz., that Papias is not worthy of credit, because he was devoted to the collection of oral traditions and has been called a *simpleton* by Eusebius. Papias himself, as quoted by Eusebius, says: "I took no pleasure (*οὐ... ἔχαιρον*) in such as talked a great deal, but in those who taught what was true; [I did not give heed] to those who related strange doctrines, but to those [who related] things which were added to the faith [i. e. to the Christian religion] by the Lord, and which had their origin in the truth itself." He then goes on to say, that whenever he met with any one who had been conversant with the Elders, he inquired of them what Andrew, Peter, Philip, etc., had said. In all this, now, I do not perceive, as some writers affect to do, any marks of an enthusiastic and undiscerning collector and retailer of stories or reports, but merely the natural and ardent curiosity of a mind deeply intent on the collection of sayings and doings, that were connected with individuals whose characters were highly venerated, and whose opinions were matters of lively interest to sincere Christians of the second generation.

But Eusebius, in the sequel, names several matters which he found in the volume of Papias, that have respect to miraculous things said to have taken place in regard to Philip one of the apostles, and Barsabas or Justus chosen in the room of Judas, Acts 1: 23; which, however, are nothing peculiarly strange, provided Mark 16: 17, 18 be regarded as true. Besides these, Eusebius says that Papias sets forth *ξένας τέ τινας παραβολὰς τοῦ Σωτῆρος, καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τινὰ ἄλλα μυθικώτερα*, i. e., 'certain strange parables of the Saviour, and doctrines of his, and some other things of rather a fabulous hue.' By *strange*

parables Eusebius doubtless means, such as are not contained in the Gospels. Among the *μυθισώτερα* he names especially the millennial and visible personal reign of Christ upon earth, after the first resurrection. Eusebius, who was himself a strenuous anti-millenarian, then declares, at the close of these representations, that "Papias was *σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν*, if one may venture to judge from his book."

Now here the principal ground of Eusebius' opinion respecting Papias seems to be laid open to our view. First, he gave too much credit to traditionary stories; and secondly, he was a believer in the millennium as understood in the grosser sense. Both of these reasons are good ones, I acknowledge, for distrust to a certain extent, viz., so far as it concerns traditional stories with which the *wonderful* is intermixed, and so far as it regards ability to interpret the prophetic Scriptures which are highly figurative. But if every man is a *simpleton*, who exhibits the like traits with Papias as to credulity or ability to interpret that part of the Apocalypse which has respect to the thousand years of Christ's reign, then we might easily make out a large list of simpletons, from ancient and from modern, yea, from recent writers—men too of great eminence and learning in many important respects.

In a matter, then, which does not concern the *wonderful*, nor yet the mode of interpreting prophecies clothed in language highly figurative, there appears to be no good reason why the testimony of Papias should be any more suspected, than that of any other well meaning and honest witness, who, on some speculative points, would not be able to form an opinion entitled to much consideration, but in the statement of a simple matter of fact would tell the truth without prejudice and without embellishment. Such is the result to which our investigation with regard to Papias seems to conduct us; and his testimony may now be produced and examined to some good advantage.

According to Eusebius, Papias relates a traditionary account which he had heard from John the Presbyter, respecting the composition of the Gospel of Mark, viz., that Mark wrote it down, as he had heard it for substance in the often repeated preaching of Peter. Papias then passes immediately on to a brief mention of the Gospel of *Matthew*; but he does not tell us explicitly whether what he then relates was also received from John the Presbyter, or not; although, from the connection in which the passage stands, it seems most natural to con-

clude, that he means to be understood as intimating such to be the case. His words are ; "Matthew wrote oracles (λόγια, accounts, narrations) in the *Hebrew dialect* ; and then each one interpreted them as he could."*

That by the *Hebrew dialect* is here meant the language which the Jews of that day spoke and wrote in Palestine, there can be no rational doubt. This was a mixture of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac, with some modifications in grammar peculiar to itself ; as we know from the Jerusalem Targum, written not long after this period. We know this, also, from the few sentences of the native language of Palestine, at that time, which are preserved in the Gospels.

No claim has ever been set up, I believe, for Papias as a Hebrew scholar. There is no evidence, and no probability, that he had any acquaintance with the Hebrew language. He could not judge, then, of a supposed original *Hebrew Gospel* of Matthew, in consequence of any intimate personal knowledge of the subject. From common report, or (as in this case seems most probable) from John the Presbyter, he must have derived this tradition. From what source John derived it, or who this John was, or whether he had himself any personal knowledge of the Hebrew—are questions which history does not enable us to answer. The probability seems to be, from the name of this Presbyter (Ἰωάννης), that he was of Jewish origin.

But what is the meaning of the clause : "Each one *interpreted* them [the narrations] as he could ?"

Of a *written* interpretation we cannot think, even for a moment. Had there been many such, as would have been the case provided we are so to understand Papias, we can scarcely imagine that this would not have been mentioned. The simple meaning seems to be, that each one into whose hands Matthew's original Gospel fell, who had any ability to interpret the Hebrew original, did it according to the measure of his ability. Another limitation still must be added, in order to make out any tolerable sense. Papias cannot be understood as referring to readers to whom the Hebrew was *vernacular*. These had no need of *interpreting* a Hebrew Gospel ; for they understood it better as it was, than they could do in the language of any version. Papias, then, must have meant to say, that every

* Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο, ἡρμηνεύουσι δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἡδύνατο ἕκαστος. Euseb. Hist. Ecc. III. 39.

person who spoke Greek and had more or less knowledge of the Hebrew, made out the sense of Matthew's Hebrew Gospel as well as he could. This would seem to imply, either that there had been a time when there was no regular *written* translation of Matthew into the Greek, or else that such as could not, or did not, obtain this translation, made out the meaning as well as they could from the original Hebrew. The latter seems to be the more probable meaning of Papias here ; for inasmuch as he speaks of Mark in conjunction with Matthew, there can be scarcely a doubt, as Olshausen has remarked, that the *Corpus Evangelicum*, or *Collection of the Four Gospels*, (*Εὐαγγέλια, Εὐαγγελικόν*) was already in circulation among the churches ; and if so, then undoubtedly the *Greek* translation of Matthew had already been made, and was in use by the churches at large.

On this account, the declaration of Papias, viz., that " each one interpreted them [the narrations] as he could," has been thought to be very strange, and much severe comment has been made upon the good father, on account of this inaccurate and seemingly unmeaning expression. A little candour, however, would remove, as it seems to me, all serious difficulty. We have only to imagine the limitations above stated, and there is nothing in the declaration of Papias which would seem to deserve any special animadversion, believing, as he did, in the existence of a Hebrew original of Matthew.

But we have not yet done with this subject. The testimony of Papias, in this case, like all other testimony of the fathers, is a fair subject of examination, while the cause is pending. The witness may lawfully, and in this case must, be cross-examined.

At all adventures, so far as we know, Papias speaks, in regard to the matter before us, what he had learned only by tradition, and not from any personal acquaintance with a *Hebrew* Gospel. It matters not whether he had this traditional account from John the Presbyter, (as seems most probable), or from any other source entitled to the like credit. There can be no reasonable doubt, that such a view of this subject prevailed extensively in the ancient churches ; and, I doubt not, it must have been prevalent in the time of Papias. But whence did it originate ? And what are the circumstances which will account for its origin, without necessitating us to suppose it to be matter of fact, that Matthew actually wrote his Gospel in Hebrew ? This

is the cross-examination which should be made of Papias' testimony, before the cause comes to a final issue.

It is a matter well known among all who are acquainted with the writings of the earlier fathers, that there existed in very early times a *Gospel κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, or, as it was perhaps more frequently named, a *Gospel κατ' Ἑβραίους*, and sometimes κατ' ἀποστόλους. This Gospel was current among the Jewish converts, who began very early to be called by way of distinction *Ebionites*, and afterwards *Nazarenes*, and then *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites*, because they were divided into two different sects. Several of the fathers make no distinction, however, sometimes comprising them all under the one name, and sometimes under the other. Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen, call them *Ebionites*. The leading distinction of these sects seems to have been, that the Ebionites held to the universal obligation of the Mosaic law, and also maintained the mere humanity of Christ; while the Nazarenes held the law to be obligatory only upon Jews, and in other respects do not seem to have been justly exposed to the charge of heresy, although this was sometimes made against them.

Among both of those sects (how early they were divided we know not), there was in circulation, the so-named *Gospel according to the Hebrews*; among the Ebionites, as Epiphanius testifies (Haëres. c. 3. 13. al.), with the two first chapters excluded; but among the Nazarenes, unimpaired, i. e. not curtailed.

What sort of a Gospel this was, we shall have occasion to inquire in the sequel. Here we confine ourselves to the simple inquiry: *At how early a period can we trace any testimonies of its being in existence.*

Eusebius (H. E. IV. 22) has given us an account of Hegesippus, an ecclesiastical historian of much credit, who flourished in the time of Justin Martyr, i. e. about 140 seq. From him Eusebius states that he had copiously extracted in his own work; and he then adds: "Some things he [Hegesippus] produces from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, even the Syriac, and appropriately of the Hebrew dialect, thus showing that he was himself a believer of Hebrew origin."* The word *Syriac* has been much commented upon in this place; and many have

*"Ἐκ τῆς τοῦ κατ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου, καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ, καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊδος διαλέκτου, τινὰ τίθεισι, ἐμφαίνων ἐξ Ἑβραίων αὐτὸν πιστευμένον.

felt it to be very obscure, while others have deduced strange conclusions from it. Jerome (adv. Peleg. III. 1) has afforded us a satisfactory solution of the difficulty; where, speaking of this same Gospel, he says: "*Evangelium juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico Syroque sermone scriptum est,*" i. e. 'it is written in the *Syro-Chaldaic*;' which was *the Hebrew of that day*.

There can be no doubt, then, that very early in the second century the so-called *Gospel according to the Hebrews* was extant, and also in the Hebrew language of the day.

After this period we meet with still more decided evidence of its existence. Clement of Alexandria, at the close of the second century, cites a passage from it, i. e. from some Greek translation of it, (for Clement did not understand the Hebrew), which he prefaces by the following expression: *Ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἑβραίου εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται*. That this was in some respects a different Gospel from our present Greek Matthew, is evident from the fact, that the passage which Clement here cites is not found in our copies; Clem. Opp. II. p. 453. ed. Potteri.

Eusebius, moreover, in his Hist. Ecc. VI. 17, speaks of *Symmachus*, the well known early Greek translator of the Scriptures, who was contemporary with Clement of Alexandria, as having appealed to *the Gospel according to the Hebrews*, in order to confirm his own heretical sentiments. But as the passage in which Eusebius thus speaks is obscure in some respects, and has been a matter of controversy in regard to its real import, I will not cite it at length in this place. I may, however, confidently refer to it as one of the clear proofs of the supposed existence of the Gospel in question, in the time of Symmachus.

Origen (about 240) speaks often of this same Gospel, and makes several quotations from it. He thus introduces it in his Tract. VIII. in Matthew, of which we have the Latin translation: "*Scriptum est in evangelio quodam, quod dicitur secundum Hebraeos, etc.*" Again, (Comm. in Jer. Homil. XV. and Comm. in Johann. II. p. 53, ed. de La Rue), he professedly cites another passage from this Gospel. Both of the passages which Origen cites, are wanting in our present Gospel; as we shall hereafter see.

Eusebius (H. E. III. 27), speaking of the Ebionites, says: *Εὐαγγέλιον δὲ μόνον τῷ κατ' Ἑβραίου λεγόμενον χρώμενοι, τῶν λοιπῶν σμικρὸν ἐποιοῦντο λόγον,* i. e. 'using the Gospel according to the Hebrews, they make very little account of the others.'

Epiphanius, at the close of the fourth century, speaks often

of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. In Haer. XXX. 3, he says of the Ebionites, that "they receive the Gospel *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, and this only do they (as well as the Cerinthians) use. They call it, moreover, *κατὰ Ἑβραίους*," i. e. 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews.' In Haer. XXX. 13 he speaks still more expressly: "In the Gospel named *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, which is current among them [the Ebionites], not in its complete and entire form, but adulterated and curtailed, and which they call *Ἑβραϊκόν*, it is said, etc."*

Jerome speaks many times of the Gospel *secundum Hebraeos* or *juxta Hebraeos*; sometimes he called it the Gospel *duodecim apostolorum*, and then the Gospel *juxta Matthaeum*. In his book *de Viris Illustribus* (c. III.), he says that "Matthew wrote the Gospel of Christ in Hebrew letters and words. . . A copy in the Hebrew is preserved at the present time in the library at Caesarea. . . . I also obtained an exemplar from the Nazarenes of Beroea in Syria, who gave me leave to copy it." Of this copy Jerome made both a Greek and a Latin translation.

The reader should be notified here, that while the words of Jerome, in this passage, seem to confound the original Gospel of Matthew with this Gospel of the Nazarenes, yet he elsewhere makes a distinction so clear between them, besides giving quotations from the latter which exhibit important discrepancies, that there can be no doubt that he did not consider them in all respects, or even in all important respects, as one work.

From very early times, then, i. e. from the time of Hegesippus (about 140) we have decisive testimony that a *Gospel according to the Hebrews* was in circulation. But nothing decisive as to the similarity of this with our canonical Matthew, is produced by Eusebius, in his narrative respecting the quotation from it by Hegesippus.

Besides Hegesippus, we have no testimony which will satisfy us, that any of the Christian fathers, excepting Clement of Alexandria and Origen, ever saw this Gospel, until we come down to Epiphanius and Jerome, at the close of the fourth century. As to Clement, who quotes from it, he had no knowledge of Hebrew, and therefore, as we may reasonably

* Ἐν τῷ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ, οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληροιστάτῳ ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἡκρωτηριασμένῳ, Ἑβραϊκόν δὲ καλοῦσι, ἐμφέρεται κ. τ. λ.

conclude, he must have had a *Greek* translation of it. But Origen, who has also repeatedly quoted it, had some knowledge of the Hebrew; yet there is not the slightest appearance, in any of his quotations, that he cited from the *Hebrew* copy of the Gospel κατ' Ἑβραίων. There can be scarcely a doubt, that a Greek translation of this was current in some degree at Alexandria, in the time of Clement and Origen; but it would seem that this must have perished, however, before the time of Jerome, inasmuch as he made a new Greek version of the Hebrew copy.

Two or three questions more must be briefly discussed, before our way is clear to put a right estimate upon the testimony of the fathers respecting a *Hebrew* original of Matthew.

(1) *Was the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the same in all important respects as our canonical Matthew, so far as we can gather from the fathers; or was it an interpolated and in many respects a spurious Matthew?*

The latter beyond all reasonable question, as the facts which follow will shew. If we except some passages in Justin Martyr, which some critics suppose to have been taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, we find no quotations of a decisive character, until we come down to Clement of Alexandria. Although Eichhorn, Credner, and several other writers, earnestly contend that Justin must have quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, yet as Justin nowhere makes mention of such a work, and as he appeals constantly to his Ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, we cannot be safe in taking it for granted that he used the Nazarene Gospel. That which he seems to have quoted from it, may be naturally accounted for, from his acquaintance with Jews and Jewish traditions, which repeated many things found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Clement gives us different ground, on which we may with more safety take our stand. "It is written," says he (Opp. Strom. II. p. 453 ed. Potteri), "in the Gospel κατ' Ἑβραίων Ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει, καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύσεται." Such an expression is nowhere found in our canonical Matthew.

Origen (Tract. VIII. in Matt.), in the old Latin translation of him which has been preserved, says: "In a certain Gospel, which is called *Secundum Hebraeos*, it is written: Another rich man said to him [Jesus], Master, what good thing shall I do that I may live? He said to him: Obey the law and the

prophets. He answered : I have done so. He said to him ; Go, sell all which thou hast, and give it to the poor ; then come and follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head (coepit scalpere caput suum), and it did not please him ; and the Lord said to him : How canst thou say, I have obeyed the law and the prophets, since it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself ? Behold ! many of my brethren, the sons of Abraham, are clothed with filth, and dying by reason of hunger ; yet thy house is full of many good things, and still nothing at all goes from it to them. Then turning to Simon his disciple, sitting near him, he said : Simon, son of Joanne, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man [to enter] into the kingdom of heaven."

What a tasteless compiler he must have been, who furnished out such a paragraph as this for the Jewish converts of early times, is evident enough from the bare perusal of it. But this is not all. Take another quotation by Origen from this Gospel of the Nazarenes, in his Comm. in Jer. Homil. XV. Opp. Vol. III. According to Origen, the following words are put, by this Gospel, into the mouth of the Saviour: ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου, καὶ ἀπένεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα, Θαβώρ, i. e. 'then my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of the hairs of my head, and carried me to the great mountain, Tabor.'

Beyond this we can gather no definite materials from Clement and Origen, which will help us to determine the condition of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Eusebius (III. 39) says : "Papias in his *Ἐξηγήσεις* has told a story of a woman accused to the Saviour of many sins." He then adds : ἦν τό καθ' *Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον κατέχει*, i. e. which [story] the Gospel according to the Hebrews contains. What this story was, we are not informed ; but it seems probable enough, that it was the account of the woman taken in adultery (John 8: 2—11), which had been added to the Nazarene or Ebionite Gospel of Matthew, by some interpolating hand. At any rate, it plainly consisted of matter foreign to our present canonical Gospel.

We have already seen, that Epiphanius expressly testifies concerning the Ebionites, that they used an adulterated and curtailed Gospel of Matthew, although the Nazarenes made use of one which was *πληρέστατον*. In another place he has dis-

closed more fully his meaning, by telling us that the two first chapters of Matthew were wanting in the copies of the Ebionites, and that their Gospel began with the third chapter of Matthew in this manner: *Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων κ. τ. λ.* Haeres. XXX. 13.

In the same place Epiphanius makes several long quotations from the Gospel in question, which are adapted to give us a fuller insight into the true condition of this work. I shall merely exhibit a translation of some of these; referring the reader, who wishes to verify this, to the original in Epiphanius, or to Olshausen who has exhibited the originals in his work on the Genuineness of the Gospels, pp. 52 seq.

The passages now to be cited must have stood very near the commencement of the Ebionite Gospel.

“There was a certain man named Jesus, and he was about thirty years of age, *who chose us*; and coming to Capernaum, he entered into the house of Simon who is called Peter, and opening his mouth he said: Passing along the Lake of Tiberius, I chose John and James, sons of Zebedee, and Simon and Andrew, and Thaddeus and Simon Zelotes, and Judas Iscariot; *and thee Matthew*, sitting at the receipt of custom, I called, and thou didst follow me. I will, therefore, that there should be twelve apostles for a testimony to Israel. And John was baptizing, and there went out to him, etc.” The sequel is nearly in the words of Matthew 3: 4—7, with some few changes in the order of words, and some in the diction.

In the same chapter of Epiphanius is contained another paragraph of the Gospel before us, which has respect to the baptism of John, and which should be presented to the reader as another specimen of the Hebrew Gospel.

“Now when the people were baptized, Jesus came and was baptized by John; and when he came up from the water, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the shape of a dove descending and coming upon him; and there was a voice from heaven saying: Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And again: This day have I begotten thee. And straightway a great light shone about the place. John, beholding this, said: Who art thou Lord? And again there was a voice from heaven to him: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Then John, falling down before him, said: I beseech thee, Lord, baptize thou me.

But he forbade him, saying : Suffer it, for it is meet that all things should thus be fulfilled."

In Haeres. XXX. 14 Epiphanius cites another passage from the Ebionite Gospel, which, as I apprehend, gives us a very fair specimen of the general tenor of this Gospel, and its near relation to the genuine one of Matthew. That the reader may make the comparison of the two with facility, I here present them both in the Greek, that of the Nazarene Gospel being a copy of the Greek version (if it be a version) which Epiphanius has given us.

Matt. XII. 47—50.

Ἔειπε δὲ τις αὐτῷ· Ἰδοὺ, ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἐστήκασιν, ζητοῦντές σοι λαλήσαι· Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε τῷ εἰπόντι αὐτῷ· Τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου; καὶ τίνας εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου; Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν· Ἰδοὺ, ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου. Ὅστις γάρ ᾤν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφός καὶ ἀδελφή καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Σώτηρ, ἐν τῷ ἀπαγγεῖλαι αὐτόν, ὅτι ἰδοὺ! ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἐστήκασιν, εἶπε· Ὅτι τίς μου ἐστὶν μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί; Καὶ ἐκτείνας ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς τὴν χεῖρα, ἔφη· Οὗτοι εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου καὶ ἡ μήτηρ, οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

The reader will see, that in the present case, the Gospel according to the Hebrews is a mere abridgment of our canonical Matthew.

In Haeres. XXX. 16, Epiphanius expressly cites the Gospel among the Ebionites as containing the following passage : "I came to abolish the sacrifices; and if ye will not cease from offering sacrifices, wrath will not cease from you."

In XXX. 22 Epiphanius complains of the Ebionites for having altered the sense of a passage in Matthew 26: 17, *Where wilt thou that we make ready to eat the passover?* inasmuch as their Gospel makes him say : "I have *not* much desired to eat this passover-flesh with you." Here is a passage transferred, as it would seem, from Luke 22: 15, with the negative *μή* added to it, so as to reverse the true sense of the expression.

These are the principal passages which Epiphanius has given us from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Jerome, who obtained a copy of this Gospel from the Nazarenes at Beroea in Syria, and who translated it into Greek and Latin, has pre-

served here and there in his works, more fragments of the like nature. I shall present a few of them ; in order that the reader may be enabled more fully to understand the tenor and condition of this Gospel.

In commenting on Isaiah 11: 1, "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, etc.," after giving his views of the phrase, *The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him*, he says : "Sed, juxta Evangelium quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazaraei: Descendet super eum omnis fons Spiritus Sancti."

Again ; "Porro in Evangelio cujus supra fecimus mentionem, haec scripta reperimus: Factum est, autem, quum accendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti et requievit super eum, et dixit illi: Fili mi, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te, ut venires et requiescerem in te. Tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum."

In Cont. Pelag. III. 2, Jerome says: "In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos . . . narrat historia: Ecce, mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei: Joannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus ut baptizemur ab eo. Dicit autem eis: Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum, quod dixi, ignorantia est."

Again; "Et in eodem volumine: Si peccaverit frater tuus in verbo . . . [citing nearly the words of Matt. 18: 21, 22, then adding]: Etenim in prophetis quoque, postquam uncti sunt Spiritu sancto, inventus est sermo peccati."

Again, in Comm. in Mich. 7: 6: "Qui legerit Canticum Canticorum . . . credideritque in Evangelio quod secundum Hebraeos editum nuper transtulimus [i. e. I have lately translated], in quo, ex persona Salvatoris, dicitur: Modo tulit me mater mea, Sanctus Spiritus, in uno capillorum meorum."

In his Comm. on Matt. 12: 13 he says: In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazaraeni et Ebionitae, quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum, homo iste, qui aridam manum habet, coementarius scribitur, istiusmodi auxilium precans: Coementarius eram, manibus victum queritans; precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos."

Comm. in Matt. 23: 25: "In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazaraeni, pro filio Barachine reperimus scriptum filium Jojadae.

De Viris Illust. II., Jerome says: Evangelium quoque, quod

appellatur secundum Hebraeos, et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est refert : Dominus autem quum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jacobus, se non comesturum panem ab illa hora, qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus."

Once more ; Comm. in Matt. 27: 16 Jerome says : " Iste [Barrabbas] in Evangelio quod scribitur juxta Hebraeos, *filius magistri eorum* interpretatur, qui propter seditionem et homicidium fuerat condemnatus."

There are a few other passages in Jerome of a similar tenor ; but they are brief, and need not be here cited. Enough has been already produced to shew fully what was the real internal state and condition of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

That this Gospel was an interpolated one, and in some respects therefore spurious, is self-evident from the mere perusal of the above quotations from it ; at least this is perfectly plain, if we allow our present canonical Matthew to be genuine.

But there is another view of this subject which must be taken, and which, although we might connect it with the preceding investigation, we will consider under a separate head, in order to render the understanding of the matter before us more easy.

(2) *Did the Gospel according to the Hebrews, notwithstanding such interpolations and changes as those above exhibited, so nearly resemble our canonical Matthew, that it might be called, and in common parlance was in fact often called, Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον ?*

The earlier writers, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius, when they refer to the Gospel in question, characterize it by the name, *Gospel according to the Hebrews* ; which seems to have been perhaps the more current and usual appellation. But later writers, who had a personal acquaintance with it in its Hebrew form, give us also another name, calling it sometimes the *Gospel κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. So Epiphanius says of the Ebionites (Haer. XXX. 3): *Λέχονταί τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον . . .* [and then adds], *καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ κατὰ Ἑβραίους*. Again, in Haer. XXX. 13, he says of the same : *Ἐν τῷ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ*. In Haeres. XXIX. 9 he says, with particular reference to the Nazarenes : " They have the Gospel according to Matthew in full, and in the Hebrew language ; for among them is doubtless preserved

this [Gospel] as it was written at first in Hebrew letters. But I know not whether they have removed the genealogy from Abraham to Christ."

The reader will please to note this last expression ; because it shows very plainly, that although Epiphanius had in his hands, as it would seem from some passages in his works, a copy (probably a Greek one, as we shall see hereafter), of the Ebionite Gospel, yet it appears that he had not one of the Nazarenes, inasmuch as he expressly declares, that *he does not know* whether they insert or omit the genealogy. In this state of the matter one cannot but wonder how he comes so explicitly to declare, that the Gospel of the Nazarenes is full and complete, *πληρέστατον*. But consistency, alas ! is not what we are always to expect in Epiphanius. It is sufficient, however, to account in the present case for his expressing himself in this manner, to suppose, that such was the current report among the Nazarenes themselves, and that he drew from this source.

In Haeres. XXX. 14 Epiphanius says expressly, that Cerinthus and Carpocrates used the same Gospel as the Ebionites, i. e. the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. Yet in the same place he gives this Gospel another name. He says that the above named heretics proved the natural descent of Jesus from Joseph, "by the genealogy in the beginning τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίου." Comparing the passage from Epiphanius cited above on p. 143, where he describes the Ebionite Gospel as *curtailed*, viz. deprived of the two first chapters of Matthew, with what the same author says here, there would seem to be some contradiction ; for here he says, first that Cerinthus and Carpocrates used the same Gospel as the Ebionites, and secondly that these two heretics undertook to prove the merely human origin of Jesus from the genealogy. How then could they have used the same Gospel as the Ebionites, since theirs excluded the genealogy ?

Still the reputation of this father for consistency is not so desperate even here, as it seems at first sight to be. What he means for substance to say is, that both the Ebionites, and Cerinthus with Carpocrates, made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or a Hebrew copy of the Gospel called *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. This might be true as to substance, although there might be a discrepancy as to some particular passages. That Epiphanius has expressed himself unguardedly and inaccurately, there can be no doubt ; that he has, however,

been guilty of any glaring contradiction, when candidly interpreted, it would not be so easy to make out.

The reader will note, that one thing at least is proved by the examples cited above of the expressions made use of by Epiphanius, viz., that both the Gospel of the Ebionites and of the Nazarenes was designated more or less frequently, at least among the Christians of the church catholic, by the name *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*; and that while their copies of Matthew's Gospel doubtless differed in some respects, they were generally of much the same tenor, the *basis* being in all probability the same.

The questions, whether Epiphanius had ever seen the *Hebrew* copy of the Gospel under consideration—and whether, in case he had, he could read it in the Hebrew—are not capable of being solved with much certainty. Eusebius was a native of Palestine, born probably at Eleutheropolis, a city within the limits of the tribe of Judah, at no great distance in a south-west course from Bethlehem. He was a monk in the cloister there, sometime about A. D. 360—370. He was then removed to Salamis in Cyprus, of which he was constituted bishop, and where he wrote his works. The Ebionites had their chief seats of residence, as he tells us in *Haeres. XXX. 18*, in Nabatea, Paneas, Moab, Kochabon, Adraon—all places in and around Palestine—and the island of Cyprus. Now whether we contemplate this father, before he obtained his bishopric, or afterwards, we find him in the neighbourhood of the Ebionites; which suggests a good reason for the unusually copious and particular accounts that he has given of them. That he must have understood something of the Hebrew language, one can hardly doubt who considers the place of his origin, and the society in which he lived. That he possessed knowledge enough of it to read it with facility, or to seek with eagerness and solicitude after books written in it—has not, I believe, ever yet been rendered probable.

When Olshausen assumes, therefore, as he appears to do (*Echtheit* etc. p. 55), that Epiphanius had a Hebrew copy of the Ebionite Gospel in his own hands, he assumes what it would be difficult to prove; and what Credner, in his work on the Gospel of the Jewish Christians (p. 336 seq.), has well nigh shewn to be altogether improbable. The most which we can fairly allow seems to be, that Epiphanius speaks from information communicated to him by the Ebionites, in respect to the state of their Gospel; or else, that he had a *Greek* trans-

lation of it which he consulted. The different ways in which he cites the same passages, and the manner in which some of the paragraphs cited commence, seem to prove, as Credner has shewn, that he appeals to other writings besides the Gospel, or at any rate to other sources than autopsy for his information and citations.

It should be added, in order to strengthen these remarks, that (as we have seen above p. 149) Epiphanius speaks in like manner, i. e. familiarly and confidently in many respects, of the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, which, nevertheless, it is certain even by his own confession, he had not seen.

Jerome came upon the stage while Epiphanius was living and still active. Of all the fathers Jerome had incomparably the best knowledge of the Hebrew. He also obtained a copy of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, from Jews at Beroea, and translated it both into Greek and Latin; as he expressly says in a passage above quoted from him (p. 148). His testimony, therefore, will be of more weight than all other testimony, in respect to the specialities of the subject before us.

First of all then he says, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites use the same Gospel (Opp. IV. p. 47): "*Evangelium quo utuntur Nazaraei et Ebionitae.*" He doubtless means to say this in a like sense with Epiphanius, viz., that they both have a Gospel whose basis is Matthew. So we shall see, in the sequel.

In his work *Contra Pelag.* III. 2 he says: "*In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos . . . quo utuntur usque hodie Nazaraeni . . . sive, ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthaeum.*"

Again, in his *Comm. on Matt.* 12: 13 he says: "*In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazaraeni et Ebionitae . . . quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum.*"

In other passages he appeals to this same work, sometimes with the title of *Evangelium juxta Hebraeos*, then again with the designation of "*secundum Hebraeos—quod Hebraeo Sermonē conscriptum est—quo utuntur Nazaraeni et Ebionitae—Hebraicum—quod Hebraicis literis scriptum est—quod a me translatum est, etc.*"

Here then, in the two accounts of Epiphanius and Jerome, who are the only fathers that appear to have had any minute and particular information respecting the parties of Jewish Christians, we have evidence perfectly satisfactory of the usual appellation given to their Gospel—"ut plerique autumant,

juxta Matthaeum—quod vocatur a plerisque *Matthaei authenticum*.”

Credner affects to doubt whether the Ebionites themselves ever gave to this Gospel that name. He thinks they only called it κατ' Ἑβραίους. But this opinion seems to me groundless. The name which they more habitually gave to their own Gospel, would be the name usually given to it by others. They would very naturally, one might almost say necessarily, appeal to apostolic authority in support of the Scriptures on which, and on which only, they relied; for they did not receive, at least the Ebionites did not, the other Gospels. What they gave out their Gospel to be, the public, who could not examine it, supposed it to be, and named it accordingly. Hence Jerome and Epiphanius assert in terms most clear and plain, that the appellation, or at least one appellation, of their Gospel was κατὰ Ματθαῖον.

Epiphanius again and again asserts, that this Gospel was *the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*. In Haeres. XXX. 3 he says of the Ebionites: δέχονται τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον, τοῦτο . . . χρῶνται μόνον. Καλοῦσιν δὲ αὐτὸ κατὰ Ἑβραίους, ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραῖσι καὶ Ἑβαιοῖς χάριμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποίησατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐκθεσίαν τε καὶ κήρυγμα, i. e. they receive *the Gospel according to Matthew*; this . . . only do they use. They call it, moreover, κατὰ Ἑβραίους; inasmuch as one may truly say, that Matthew only made the publication and proclamation of his Gospel in the New Testament, in Hebrew and in Hebrew characters.”

In a passage before cited on p. 145 above, Epiphanius says of the Nazarenes: “They have *the Gospel according to Matthew* in full and in Hebrew. Among them this is undoubtedly still preserved, as it was at first written, in Hebrew letters.”

Now if we add to this, Jerome's *ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthaeum*, and *quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum*, no reasonable doubt can be left, that the ancient churches and individual Christians thought and spoke of the Gospel according to the Hebrews as being for substance the same as the Gospel of Matthew. It was given out to be such, by those who used it. Even men like Epiphanius, who made it a subject of inquiry, usually spoke of it as such, when they did not wish to go into particulars or to be minute; and Jerome himself with all his minute and accurate and certain knowledge of it,

not unfrequently names it, and refers to it, in the like manner with others.

We are come at last near to the end of our digression ; if indeed that may be called *digression*, which enters essentially into the estimate of the testimony on which the whole question before us depends. One brief inquiry more will bring us to the position, from which we may look out and take a satisfactory survey, at least so it seems to me, of the whole ground that is to be occupied. This is,

(3) *Did those ancient fathers who had any particular acquaintance with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, suspect its claims to canonical authority, or rather, reject them ; and this notwithstanding they often spoke in the popular way respecting this Gospel as though it belonged to Matthew, or was the same with his ?*

With the exception of Hegesippus, of whose work only fragments are preserved in Eusebius, there were none of the early fathers who could read the Gospel according to the Hebrews in the language in which it was current among the Nazarenes and Ebionites, if we exempt Origen and Jerome. Epiphanius might be claimed by some ; but we have already viewed the ground on which this claim stands.

We have seen above (p. 141), that the testimony of Hegesippus, preserved by Eusebius, avails nothing as to the present question ; inasmuch as Eusebius merely says, that ‘Hegesippus cites some things from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and thus shews that he was of Hebrew origin.’ This does not enable us to make any accurate estimate in regard to what Hegesippus thought of the authority of this Gospel.

Clement of Alexandria has quoted but one short sentence (p. 144 above), and this without saying any thing which gives us definite views what his opinion of the authenticity of this Gospel was. He must have quoted from a *Greek* copy, (unless indeed he learned what he has quoted from some Jewish Christians), for he had no knowledge of the Hebrew.

Origen, however, had some knowledge of this kind ; although nothing in his quotations renders it certain that he had seen the Hebrew copy. But at all events, this critical father had in some measure weighed the subject in his mind, respecting the authenticity of this Gospel, and plainly doubted of it. So it would seem to be, if we may trust his old and literal interpreter into Latin, who has preserved for us a declaration of

Origen, in his Tract. VIII. ad Matt. 19: 19. Origen's words are : "Scriptum est in evangelio *quodam*, quod dicitur secundum Hebraeos, *si tamen placet alicui suscipere illud non ad auctoritatem, sed ad manifestationem propositae questionis.*" Then follows the quotation from this Gospel presented on p. 144 above.

Let the reader mark here, first the phrase *evangelio quodam*. The implication of course is, that what is to be quoted stands not in *THE Gospel*, but in a certain writing which some claim as a Gospel. What follows clearly evinces this to be 'the sense ; viz., *if indeed it is agreeable to any one to admit this (or receive this), not in the way of authority (or as authoritative), but for the sake of illustrating the question proposed.* Origen takes it for granted that the *authority* of the *Evangelium quoddam* will be excepted to. He tacitly acknowledges the propriety of such an exception. He does not ask, therefore, that it should be received as *authoritative*, but only that it may be admitted by way of illustration or explanation.

That such were the views of this critical father, there can be no doubt ; for in all his reasonings, homilies, and commentaries, he never appeals to this Gospel in the way of citing an authority. It is plain, therefore, that he did not regard it as such.

Epiphanius, as we have seen above (p. 142), although he calls the Ebionite Gospel *the Gospel κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, and avers that the original Matthew in Hebrew letters is preserved among the Nazarenes, yet explicitly states, at the same time, that the Gospel used by the Ebionites was not *πληρέστατον*, but *νεοθευμένον καὶ ἡκρωτηριασμένον*, i. e. 'not complete, *integer*, but adulterated and curtailed.' Again, in Haeres. XXX. 22 he accuses the Ebionites of having altered Matt. 26: 17, and inserted *μὴ ἐπιθυμία ἐπιθύμησα κρέας τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν*. And lastly, nearly all the quotations he makes from the Gospel in question go to shew, and probably were designed to shew, what discrepancy there is between this and the canonical Gospel of Matthew. With all the appellations which he bestows on the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and all his declarations about its being the original of Matthew's Gospel, etc., it is manifest that he disregards its *authority*, and never thinks of appealing to it for the purpose of establishing any Christian doctrine.

One may say, as some have said, that he is inconsistent with

himself; and in some respects this cannot be denied. But, as I have before remarked, the inconsistency is rather apparent than real. In the one case, Epiphanius discloses the common views of the Christian Jews respecting their Gospel—views that seem to have been adopted without examination by other Christians, and tacitly acknowledged; in the other, he gives us a view of the state of the Jewish Gospel as it really was, and he fully and practically shews his own opinion of it, by not appealing to it in the way of authority.

Jerome has expressed, for substance, the very same opinion of the Gospel according to the Hebrews as Origen had done before him. He not only intimates, as he plainly does in the passages quoted above, viz., *a plerisque vocatur Matthæi authenticum*, and *ut plerique autumant juxta Matthæum*, that all were not agreed as to the Gospel of the Hebrews being an authentic work of Matthew, but in another place he says expressly in regard to it: "*Si non uteris ad auctoritatem, saltem, utere ad antiquitatem, quid omnes viri ecclesiastici senserint;*" *Advers. Pelag.* III. 1. Exactly as Origen, he here expresses himself in regard to the *authority* of the Nazarene Gospel; he does not presume to rely on it as *authority*, for he does not expect this will be conceded to him; but he may refer to that book as a testimony of what the ancients in the church thought respecting the matter in question.

We are now at the end of our disquisition. Let us stop for a moment, and recapitulate the substance of what seems to be sufficiently established.

I. There was current among Jewish Christians, during the second, third, and fourth centuries, a Gospel often, and (as it would seem) usually, named the Gospel *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, but also very often named *κατὰ ἑβραίων*, and sometimes *the Gospel of the twelve Apostles*. This was given out by the Jewish readers of it as the work of Matthew, and was thought and said by them, and consequently by others, to have been composed by him in the Hebrew language of that period.

II. Of all the ancient fathers whose testimony we have respecting it, Origen and Jerome were the only ones who were capable of minutely examining its state, and condition, and

. I do not bring Hegesippus into this number, though he was probably a Jew and could read the Hebrew. I have not any testimony from him which will aid us in ascertaining the real state and claims of this Gospel. Clem-

ent of Alexandria, and probably Epiphanius, could examine only by the testimony of others, or through the medium of some Greek translation of it to which they had access.

III. There must have been a great resemblance in most parts of this Gospel to our canonical Matthew ; otherwise Jerome, Epiphanius, Origen, and others, cannot well be supposed to have expressed themselves concerning it as they have done, calling it *the Gospel according to Matthew* ; although we may well suppose the leading reason for their so doing, was the fact that the Jewish readers of it gave it, oftentimes or perhaps more commonly, that name. That the latter gave it out as the work of an apostle, must follow almost of necessity from the credit which they held to be due to it.

IV. The quotations from it which the ancient fathers have transmitted to us, and the estimate which they expressly as well as tacitly and impliedly make of it, shew clearly that they did not, after all, regard it as authoritative, or entitled to the reception of the catholic church. Had it been true that they considered it as *authentic*, most certainly it would have been appealed to as such ; and Jerome would have insisted that his translation of it, like his version of the Old Testament Scriptures, should be received instead of the common Greek Gospel of Matthew then in circulation. But this he never did ; and this did no one of the ancient fathers.

It is now proper to remark, that we have in this view sufficient facts before us to account for all the seemingly contradictory statements of Epiphanius and Jerome respecting the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and to shew in what manner these are to be reconciled with each other. When these fathers tell us, that the Nazarenes were in possession of the original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, and that it was named *the Gospel κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, they tell us what were the current estimation and name of it among the Jewish Christians of their times. They show what it was given out for by the readers of it in Hebrew, among whom it was in circulation. But when they come to give us a nearer insight into the actual state and condition of this Gospel, they let us see at once that it was an adulterated and interpolated Gospel, and they never once intimate that it should be substituted at all for the canonical Matthew, but the contrary.

We have now attained, then, as it seems to me, a stand-point from which we may look abroad upon the whole subject, as it

lies spread out before us in the works of the ancient fathers. We may now make a rational and consistent estimate of all the evidence so often appealed to, in favour of a *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*.

A few of the declarations of this kind, such as are the strongest and most prominent, I will now cite ; and then subjoin some remarks upon the whole.

The testimony of Papias, which perhaps was that of John the Presbyter, has been already cited above (p. 139), and given rise to the discussion through which we have passed. We come then to other writers in succession. I give only the translation here, because the originals (to which reference is made) may at any time be consulted by the inquisitive reader, and nothing particular is now dependent on a very exact construction, inasmuch as I fully concede that the ancients have spoken in the manner alleged by Mr. Norton, although I do not draw the same conclusion from their words which he does.

Irenaeus (Haeres. III. 1), as represented in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. V. 8, speaks in the following manner of the Gospel of Matthew : "Matthew published (ἐξένευκεν) a Gospel among the Hebrews, written in their own language."

Origen, as set forth in Euseb. Hist. VI. 25, says : "The first [Gospel] was written by Matthew . . . composed in Hebrew letters, and given out to converts from Judaism."

Eusebius himself, in conformity with these traditionary accounts, says in Hist. Ecc. III. 24 : "Matthew at first preached the Gospel to the Hebrews ; and when he was desirous to go and preach to others, delivering his Gospel to them, written in their vernacular language, he supplied the place of his own personal presence among those whom he left, by this writing."

Epiphanius has already been quoted above ; but I will here produce one seemingly very explicit passage from his Haeres. XXIX. 9. He is speaking of the Jewish Christians, and says : "They [the Nazarenes] use the Gospel according to Matthew in full and in Hebrew ; for among them this is undoubtedly (σαφῶς) preserved, as it was written at first, in the Hebrew language." And the like to this he says in some other places.

Jerome, soon after this (in his Lib. de Vir. Illust., Art. Matthaeus) says : "[Matthew] first composed a Gospel of Christ in Hebrew words and letters, on account of those of the circumcision in Judea who became believers. *Quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est.*"

Again, in 'his Proleg. in Matt. (Vol. IV. p. 3) he says : "Matthew first published his Gospel in Judea, in the Hebrew language, particularly on account of those Jews who believed in Jesus."

In other places he speaks in the like way ; e. g. in Epist. ad Damas. IV. p. 148—ad Hedibiam, IV. p. 173. Comm. in Jes. III. p. 63. Comm. in Oseam, III. p. 1311.

A few other passages might be gleaned ; but none are so strong and plain as these. Eusebius relates (Ecc. Hist. V. 10) a tradition respecting Pantaenus, viz., that 'he went εἰς Ἰουδαίαν [probably some part of Arabia Felix] and preached, and there found the Gospel of Matthew, written in Hebrew letters, which, according to report, the apostle Bartholomew had delivered to them.' But whether this was a translation on account of those who could not speak Greek, or a copy of a Hebrew original made on account of the Arabians who might understand the Hebrew dialect, we have no means of determining. This testimony seems hardly direct enough, therefore, to be brought into the account.

Mr. Norton, and Olshausen, Campbell, Kuinoel, and many others, assume the position, in view of all this testimony of the fathers, that we must either concede the fact of an original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, or else abandon all deference to ancient testimony.

I do not feel compelled to do either the one or the other. Certainly I cannot relinquish the ground, that credit is due to ancient testimony. But, on the other hand, I cannot take the ground that this testimony is to be received without examination—careful examination of all the circumstances which may have shaped it so as it now appears to us. Let all the witnesses be cross-examined ; not with the craft of a hired advocate, who is paid well for the dexterity with which he suppresses, or confuses, or embarrasses an honest witness and makes him speak contradictory, but with strenuous and hearty effort to educe the truth.

Now there are circumstances attending this matter of an original Hebrew Matthew, or at any rate attending the supposition that our canonical Matthew is only a *translation*, which cannot be disposed of to my satisfaction, and, as I expect to shew in the sequel, cannot well be disposed of by any critical skill or acumen, so as to comport with the supposition that we have in our canon only a *translated* Matthew. I must cast

myself here on the confidence of the reader, for a little while, in order to finish my present discussion of these ancient testimonies ; and I beg him at least to admit it for the present as possible, or rather as probable, that such circumstances as those just named can be adduced.

On such ground, then, we find ourselves to be in the following predicament. There are acts and circumstances which appear to render it improbable that our present Gospel is a *translation* ; they are seemingly irreconcilable with this supposition. Yet the ancient fathers have agreed, that in earlier and later times a report was spread throughout the churches and generally believed, that the Gospel of Matthew was originally written in Hebrew. What shall be said—what can be done—in such a predicament as this ?

My answer is at hand. The first thing to be done is, to see whether there are not some circumstances which will explain all the fathers have said, and explain it in such a way as impeaches neither their integrity nor their understandings, and at the same time will allow all the weight of the arguments which go to disprove the correctness of their opinion as to an original Hebrew Gospel. Such circumstances, as it appears to me, are plainly found in the history of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. From about A. D. 100 to A. D. 400 we can distinctly trace the existence of such a Gospel ; and we have assurances of its general resemblance to the canonical Matthew, in the name *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* which was commonly given to it. It was a Gospel which was written in the Hebrew language of the day. It could not therefore be understood, and consequently was not read, by the great body of Christians belonging to the church catholic. Of all the fathers even of the early ages, only Origen and Jerome could read and examine it. It circulated among Christians who had separated themselves from the catholic church, on the ground of Jewish rites and ceremonies ; and so far as it respects the Ebionites, on the ground also of fundamental disagreement with the church catholic in respect to the rank and dignity of the Redeemer's person. There was constantly more and more alienation springing up between the church catholic and these Jewish Christians, so that the latter kept themselves entirely aloof, and were not treated by the Gentile Christians as a part of their brotherhood, and were not disposed to seek for or accept such treatment. It was thus matters went on through the second, third, and fourth centuries.

Soon after these had elapsed we hear no more of the Jewish Christians, and must naturally suppose that they dwindled away until they became extinct.

In the mean time it is altogether clear, that from a very early period, (there can be no good reason to doubt, that even before the expiration of the first century), they had a rallying-point for their sectarian views in the so-called *Gospel κατὰ Ματθαῖον* or *Gospel κατ' Ἐβραίους*. They could not have kept themselves in countenance, nor even in existence, as a Christian sect, without some such central point around which they must revolve. That they regarded their Gospel as of *apostolic* origin, there can be no reasonable doubt, because they would otherwise not have rejected all other Gospels. That it originally had its basis in the Gospel of Matthew, one is strongly tempted to believe, from the manner in which Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome speak of it. But whether it was translated from Matthew's canonical Greek Gospel, or *vice versa*, that is a point on which we have no explicit information; I mean none which, under circumstances like these, can be justly considered as decisive. We shall see in the sequel, whether I have assumed too much in this remark.

The great body of the Jewish Christians being thus early separated from the church catholic, by their language and by their opinions, and great aversion existing between the two parties, the church at large gave themselves little or no concern about them or their Scriptures. They indeed gave out that they had a Gospel κατὰ Ματθαῖον. It was natural enough to suppose that Matthew might have left such an one for his kinsmen after the flesh. It was reported among the churches, and commonly believed, that he did; and the fathers have given us that report as it came to them. They have given it honestly, and their integrity is not at all impeachable.

But mark now the result in respect to all those fathers who made any particular examination into this matter. Origen gives us a long passage from the Jewish Gospel which is wholly spurious. He gives us another which is preposterous; (p. 144 seq. above). He plainly discloses his views of the Jewish Gospel; and these are, that he does not deem it all authoritative. Epiphanius has given us many citations from the same Gospel, and expressly told us, that the Ebionites used a Matthew which was οὐκ πληρέστατον, but was νενοθευμένον καὶ ἡκρωτηριασμένον. He has given us many extracts also from the Gospel of

the Nazarenes, which shew most fully that it was an adulterated Gospel and had been the subject of many interpolations, in case our canonical Matthew was the original basis of it. Jerome, who had a most intimate knowledge of this same Gospel of the Nazarenes, and translated it both into Greek and Latin, gives us a multitude of passages from it of the same tenor with those of Origen and Epiphanius ; and these fully demonstrate what he has himself explicitly avowed, viz., that one could not appeal to this Gospel as a matter of authority.

All the testimony, then, being taken and compared together in respect to this Jewish Gospel, nothing can be plainer and more certain, than that, whatever resemblances it might have to our canonical Matthew, yet it was plainly a very different book from this, and had no substantial claims on the church for reception as authoritative. On any other ground than that which I have now taken, it is utterly incomprehensible how our canonical Matthew should have maintained its place as it did in the church. We cannot assume it as probable, that prejudice against the Jewish Christians hindered the church catholic from receiving their Gospel. The same prejudice would have operated in like manner in other cases. Yet it did not. In the controversy between the unconverted Jews and the Christians with respect to the meaning of the Old Testament predictions concerning the Messiah, the Jews accused the Septuagint of being a false translation ; while many Christian writers accused the Jews of having falsified their Hebrew Scriptures. Yet all this did not hinder Origen from correcting the text of the Septuagint so as to accord better with the Hebrew Scriptures ; nor did it influence Jerome at all as to translating anew the whole, so as to free the Christian churches from deference to the defects of their Greek Scriptures. Origen and Jerome were indeed obliged to contest some points with many of their contemporaries ; but they did so boldly, and won the victory.

With such facts in view, I now make the appeal to every candid critic, and ask : How can we possibly account for it, in case Origen and Jerome regarded the Nazarene Matthew as the real and authoritative one, that they did not at once lay aside the canonical Matthew, and appeal to the other ? Jerome furnished the churches with a Greek and Latin translation of the other ; but not a word does he say in favour of receiving it as an authentic exemplar of Matthew ; and so little regard was paid to it by the churches in general, that, to our deep regret

and great loss, it soon perished, and is now known with any degree of minuteness, only by his report and the extracts which he has given us from it.

I repeat it, that such a view as I have given above, is the only one which can reconcile these seeming inconsistencies in the fathers between their narrations at one time and their declarations at another, or between their language respecting the Hebrew *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* and their habitual treatment of this same Gospel. Whatever may be said of the mass of Christians in ancient times, or of the great body of the fathers, we cannot well suppose that Origen and Jerome, who shewed such striking independence of mind, would have thought in one way and acted in another, in regard to this whole affair.

Here then we will rest this matter of ancient testimony about a Hebrew original of Matthew. We impeach neither the integrity nor the understanding of any of the fathers in regard to this subject. We have seen, that in the state in which they were, and that circumstances being such as they were, they can not rationally be supposed to have spoken differently from what they have done. We examine what they have said, just as we examine any testimony of a historical nature; and we find, in the result, that all which they have said can be explained consistently with their integrity, and yet that such declarations, in such circumstances as theirs, cannot establish the point, on account of which appeal is so confidently made to them. In a word, we may proffer as a cogent reason for pursuing the method of argument exhibited above, that we feel compelled to resort to explanations of such a nature, by circumstances already mentioned and yet to be mentioned, which seem to forbid and exclude the supposition, that a genuine Hebrew Matthew was current in the early centuries.

§ 3. *Other circumstances which render the existence of an early genuine Hebrew Matthew improbable.*

I now proceed to redeem my pledge, by offering to the reader some further specific reasons, why we may call in question the existence of an original Matthew in the Hebrew language.

(1) Those fathers who understood the Hebrew and were acquainted with the Jewish Gospel, never appeal to it as of authority, and never recommend it to others as such.

I merely mention this here, because I have already brought it to view more fully, as connected with the preceding discussion. The fact itself will not be denied; and when admitted it is inexplicable on any satisfactory grounds which I can even

imagine, supposing the Hebrew Matthew to have been really genuine and authentic.

(2) From the earliest period in which we have any means of knowing the state of the Hebrew Gospel, it appears to be of the same character which is developed in the later fathers.

Jerome (De Viris Illust. c. XVI.) in his account of Ignatius (fl. 108), gives us the earliest quotation, I believe, from the Gospel in question. His words are: "He [Ignatius] wrote an epistle . . . to Polycarp, in which he produces a testimony from the Gospel [of the Nazarenes] lately translated by me, respecting the person of Christ, saying: I indeed saw him [the Greek here in Ignatius Epis. III. ad Smyrn. is *οἶδα*] in the flesh, after the resurrection, and I believe that he is living. And when he had come to Peter, he said to those around him, *λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἤψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν.*"

Here is palpably an interpolation, borrowed for substance from Luke 24: 39—41; and this shews, that so early as the time of Ignatius the Gospel of the Jewish Christians bore the same character as in after ages. Several passages from Justin Martyr might be cited, which are of the like tenor; but I refrain from quoting them, for reasons before stated on p. 144 above. It is possible, I admit, that Ignatius himself also borrowed his passage from some traditionary source. But the confidence of Jerome in regard to the subject, seems to be entitled to our credence.

(3) We have no evidence of the existence of any Hebrew Matthew, which does not at the same time, whenever it is such as is particular and explicit, testify to its spurious and interpolated condition.

For proof of this, I appeal to all the citations made in the preceding pages. There was *but one* Hebrew Gospel, of which we have any knowledge, among the ancient churches. Repeated testimony is given by Jerome and Epiphanius to this point; although Epiphanius shews us, that one part of the Jewish Christians, viz. the Ebionites, rejected the two first chapters of Matthew. In other respects we know of no important difference between their Hebrew Gospel and that of the Nazarenes. This father says expressly, that he does not know whether the copies in circulation among the Nazarenes exhibited the like omission or not. But other circumstances, and especially the testimony of Jerome, render it probable that they

did not. Every witness then that we have in respect to a Hebrew Matthew, when explicit and full, uniformly testifies to a spurious and interpolated Matthew, and to nothing else. Had there been any other in circulation, it could not have escaped the knowledge of some of the fathers, especially of Origen and Jerome.

(4) It is a fact, of which no one can give any satisfactory account in case a genuine Hebrew Matthew were extant in early ages, that antiquity knows nothing of the fate of it. This is the case, although we are told by many critics that such a Matthew was in extensive circulation, and was regarded as the original Scripture of Matthew. How is it that such men as Origen and Jerome should sleep over this subject, and be utterly silent? And especially Jerome, who went even to Syria to get a copy of the spurious Nazarene Gospel. It cannot be justly pretended, that any testimony which we have, respects any other Hebrew Gospel than that which Jerome translated, nor any other than that which even in the time of Ignatius was grossly interpolated.

(5) Nothing can be more certain, than that more or less of the Jews, from the earliest age of Christianity downwards, belonged to the church catholic, assented to the doctrines of Paul, and rejected the opinions of the Judaizing Christians. Now if these Jews could read Hebrew, (and who will say that at least some of them could not?) what reason can be offered why they should not have held on to the original Hebrew Matthew, and thus have preserved it in the church catholic? No good reason can be assigned, to account in a satisfactory manner for this.

(6) That a genuine *Hebrew* Matthew did not exist in the early part of the second century, seems to be rendered almost certain from a very curious but interesting fact in regard to the Peshito or old Syriac Version of the New Testament, which is demonstrably and confessedly made from our canonical Greek Matthew.

That this Version was made in the second century, and probably during the first half of it, seems now to be generally admitted. The fact that in its original state it does not contain the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the Apocalypse, is conclusive evidence that the Version was made *before* a *corpus* of the New Testament books had got into circulation. Of course it must have been made sometime before the end of the second century.

It *could* have easily been made at that period. The Syrians had a literature of their own early in the second century, and one of great celebrity. Bardesanes flourished during this period, and likewise his son Harmonius. Of the former Jerome says (De Vir. Illustr. c. 33), that "he wrote almost an infinite number of treatises against the heretics, and a *liber clarissimus et fortissimus de fato*, which he sent to M. Aurelius Antoninus. Many other books he wrote," adds Jerome, "concerning persecution, which his followers translated from the Syriac into Greek. Si autem (says he further in respect to these books) tanta vis est et fulgor in interpretatione, quantum putamus in sermone propria!" Eusebius (H. E. IV. 28) calls Bardesanes *ἄνθρωπος ἱκανώτατος, ἐν τῇ τῶν Σύρων φωνῇ διαλεκτικώτατος*.

Harmonius, his Son, was brought up at Athens, and rivalled his father in literary eminence. He became the favourite poet of the Syrians, in their own language.

It does not certainly appear that Bardesanes was acquainted with the Greek; although it is quite possible that he was. Living in Mesopotamia, he was beyond the reach of much familiar Greek communication.

Now in what language did he read the New Testament in order to compose all his religious books? On the supposition that he understood the Greek, which may be allowed, yet as he wrote so many religious books in Syriac, is it probable that there was then no Syriac version of the New Testament? If it be possible, it cannot, all things considered, be deemed very probable. His writings must have been intended for those who could appeal to the Scriptures. But to the Greek Scriptures, the Syrians in general of Mesopotamia can hardly be thought capable of appealing.

Here then we have a version, the Peshito, of a very early age, in a language which was twin-sister to the Hebrew of the day, yea almost identical with it in a multitude of respects, and yet this version is demonstrably made, not from a *Hebrew* original of Matthew, but from the present Greek canonical Matthew! Could it enter the imagination of any Syriac translator, that a *Greek* copy on any account, either as to authority or language, was preferable to a genuine Hebrew one, supposing such an one to be current? It is almost absurd to suppose it. The business of translating into Syriac was more than three quarters done to hand, when a Syro-Chaldaic original of Matthew was obtained. All was plain, obvious, easy. But a

Greek original demanded much care, and not a little skill. That skill has indeed been exhibited fully ; a noble version the Peshito is, truly ; but then the time and pains it must have cost were wasted, in case an original Syro-Chaldaic Matthew could have been obtained.

Could it not be, if it were extant and current among Jewish Christians ? Most certainly it could. Jerome tells us, at the close of the fourth century, that he himself went into *Syria*, in order to get a copy of the Nazarene Matthew. We know, also, that in the second quarter, or rather we may say, near the close of the first quarter, of the second century, the Jews in Palestine were scattered abroad, by the devastations of Adrian which exceeded even those under Titus, over all the neighbouring countries. That there were Christian Jews in Syria and Mesopotamia, admits of no rational doubt. At all times, ever since their captivities, the Jews had been scattered over all those oriental lands. That Christianity had been early preached and propagated there, the character and writings of Bardesanes and Harmonius are a sufficient voucher. It must have been widely diffused in order to make room for so many religious books as these authors published.

I may therefore very properly ask Mr. Norton and other advocates of an original Hebrew Matthew, how such facts as these are capable of being explained, on ground such as they occupy ? I am not aware of any satisfactory answer.

Will it be said, that after all we cannot be certain that the Peshito or Old Syriac Version was made from our Greek copy of Matthew ? Those may say this, who have never compared the two. Those who have, will never think of saying it.

I have made this comparison to some extent, and in various places. In particular, I have been carefully through with the whole of the two first chapters of Matthew, and compared every word down to the minutest particle. I had special reference in so doing to the question, whether these chapters were in the copy which the Syriac translator used. And nothing can be more certain than that this was so. No one word has escaped the vigilance of the interpreter. With the exception, that the *δέ* used in the *genealogy* of Matthew, in passing from one link to another, is purposely omitted throughout the whole list of names, because it was not in keeping with the Syriac usage in regard to compositions of this nature, every *καί* and *δέ* and *γάρ* and *οὐ* even, throughout the two first chapters, is carefully

rendered by a corresponding ϕ , ψ , χ , and ψ . Even the Genitive absolute in Greek, which so often occurs in Matthew, is here rendered throughout by the corresponding particle ψ with a verb following, which is the only way that a Syrian could translate a Genitive absolute. The peculiar clause in Matthew 1: 23, *Ἐμμανουήλ, ὃ ἐστὶ μεθερμενεύμενον, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός*, (which Kuinoel disposes of in the summary way of saying that this was undoubtedly added to the Greek version of Matthew by the translator), appears *ad literam* in the old Syriac. In a word, no more doubt can arise, when one makes the comparison between the Peshito and our Greek Matthew, that they stand related as *original* and *translation*, than can arise whether our English version was made from our canonical Greek text. Nay, the Syriac is even a more minute, exact, and literal version than our own.

So for substance is it with this version throughout the whole Gospel of Matthew. One is astonished to find how exactly our present Greek text agrees with the Syriac. I consider the old Syriac, indeed, a better voucher for the integrity of our present text, than any other testimony that is extant.

The advocates for an original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew are bound, as it seems to me, to offer us some solution of the difficulty which all this presents in the way of their position.

Will it be said, that the Greek version of Matthew was the one current in the church catholic, and therefore was selected by the Syriac translator? Such an account of the matter is cutting the knot, rather than untying it. How came this Version to be current—current before the close of the first century, as we have no good room to doubt it was? Were there not Jewish converts in the church catholic, who believed with Paul and with the church catholic, and who were not separated from Christians in general by any feeling of alienation arising from sectarian views like those of the Nazarenes and Ebionites? Surely this will not be denied. Why then should the original Hebrew Matthew, in their hands, go into disrepute and desuetude? No good reason has been or can be given. Of course none can be given why the Syriac translator might not have taken a copy of the work from them, as the exemplar from which he was to make his version.

(7) I have read the present Greek Gospel of Matthew through, for the sole purpose of ascertaining whether there are

any characteristics in it of a *translation*. If there are, they have escaped me. I cannot find them. The characteristics of the whole book are marked, and apparently decisive. It is no more replete with Hebraisms than Mark ; and I may venture to say, without the fear of being contradicted by facts, than Luke ; although the contrary has often been asserted. The book bears every where the impress of the same hand. This will not be denied ; yet some attribute this to the adjusting skill of the translator. But I do not find the hand of a *foreigner* here. The easy, natural, unconstrained manner of an original writer, is just as plain and palpable throughout the whole, as in respect to any of the other Gospels. All that Mr. Norton has said, and so well said, of the prominent and original characteristics of the Gospels in other cases as still remaining, and not at all obscured by any interpolations or alterations, holds true of the Greek Matthew. A foreign addition would be instantaneously detected by a skilful reader, in case it were of any considerable length ; and the constrained manner of a translator, especially of an ancient one, cannot be pointed out in the whole of this book. The dream of Bolten, that all our New Testament writings are only *versions* of Syro-Chaldaic originals, is now universally regarded as a dream. But there is just as much reason, for aught that I can discover from the internal state of Matthew, to regard other books of the New Testament as *versions*, as there is to consider his Gospel as such.

(8) If our canonical Matthew be a *version* only, then who was the translator ?

I am aware that this question is answered by appealing to Jerome (De Viris Illust. c. 3), and quoting from him the declaration ; *Quis in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est*. Truly, *non satis certum est*. It would indeed be difficult to discover who it was. And yet such a work as this must have exhibited some memorial of its performer as well as the many smaller and more insignificant works of early Christian antiquity. Consider for a moment the nature of this case. The early Christian church were so careful and particular in their selection of Gospels, that only four of all the writings which laid claim to such a character were selected. Yet one of these, according to Mr. Norton and many others, was only a *translated* Gospel. Still the original Hebrew one, if we are to credit these critics, was all the while current and easily to be had ; and yet nobody belonging to the church catholic, neither

Jew nor Gentile, clergyman nor layman, ever once proposes to review and examine this matter, and correct any deficiencies or errors in the translated Matthew! The thing taken in its *tout ensemble*, is palpably *ἄρονον*; it is a kind of monstrosity in critical history. It requires a large allowance of faith, in order to be a believer.

Such are the leading considerations which seem to me to determine against the probability of an original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. At all events, the whole mass of quotations which we have from Matthew as a genuine book, from Justin Martyr down through the whole series of Christian writers, are from the *Greek* Matthew. No other one is known ever to have had any currency in the church catholic. The presumption—and a strong one it is under such circumstances—is fairly against the supposition, that any but the Greek Matthew was ever received by the church at large as his Gospel.

§ 4. Examination of objections.

But there are some suggestions made against these views, which it will be proper to notice, before this essay is brought to a close.

‘Matthew wrote for the Hebrews; and he could not have been well understood, if he had not written in the Hebrew language.’

An easy answer to this objection, so far as it respects the *intelligibility* of a Greek Matthew, is at hand. Hug has shewn, in his Introduction to the New Testament, Part II. § 10, that the Greek language pervaded Palestine so thoroughly, that scarcely any difficulty of this sort can be well imagined. It would be merely to do again what has already been well done, to repeat the arguments which serve to shew conclusively the truth of this position.

A single fact is incidentally recorded in Acts 22: 2, which seems conclusive in respect to this matter. Paul, at Jerusalem, was seized by the mob with a design to inflict summary vengeance on him for having violated the Jewish customs as to temple-worship. The captain of the temple-guard, however, permitted him to address the Jewish multitude. This he did in *Hebrew*. When the Jews heard their own vernacular language, *μᾶλλον παρίσχον ἡσυχίαν*, says Luke, i. e. they gave him still the better opportunity to speak by keeping silence. The inference seems unavoidable, that had he addressed them in

Greek, which they evidently expected, they could have understood him, although they would listen to Hebrew with more satisfaction.

No good reason, then, can be offered, on this ground, why Matthew might not have written in Greek. Why not, as well as the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews*, whose work is now, I believe, universally conceded to have been originally written in Greek.

Let us now examine another allegation made in the objection which we are canvassing. It is taken for granted that Matthew wrote *for the Hebrews*, and *only for the Hebrews in Palestine*. Appeal is made to a passage in Eusebius (cited above on p. 158), in which he makes such a declaration.

So far as his authority is concerned, I acknowledge, without hesitation, that he has faithfully reported a tradition which came down to him. But this, like the other report concerning the original language, we must suppose, in view of all the circumstances, was only what the Jewish Christians affirmed of their Gospel, and which was received by others in the manner that has been already stated.

I now venture to suggest, as a further answer to the allegation we are examining, that the internal state of Matthew plainly contradicts the idea that his Gospel was designed only or principally for believers in Palestine. Facts are what we need here, and to them let us now resort.

In Matt. 22: 23 the writer says: "At that time came to him Sadducees, *οἱ λεγόντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν*, who say that there is no resurrection." Did then the Jews in Palestine, among whom the Sadducees lived, (for few of these were found abroad), need to be told that the Sadducees denied a resurrection? That party had no fears, it would seem, in developing their sentiments; as is plain enough in the questions they put to Jesus concerning the woman who had had seven husbands; which the immediate sequel to the passage cited above fully exhibits. Such an explanatory clause, then, seems plainly to indicate, that the author felt himself to be addressing readers who were not much conversant with the particulars respecting the religious parties of Judea, as well as readers who were so.

In Matt. 27: 8, it is said, respecting the potter's field which had been bought with the money that Judas had abandoned: "Wherefore that field was called *the field of blood*, *ἕως τῆς σήμερον*." Did a native of Palestine, where this report was

current, and the ground of it well known, need to be told that such a report was often made within his own hearing? On the contrary; this looks like telling readers abroad, what had been and was going on in Palestine. I have cited the passage as genuine, because I do not think its credit can be shaken.

In Matt. 27: 15 the writer says: "It was the custom of the Governor, during the feast, to release some prisoner for the multitude—whomsoever they might desire." And did the Jews of Palestine need to be told this, after all their experience in regard to the customs and manners of the Roman Governors?

Matt. 27: 33. "And coming to a place called Golgotha, i. e. *the place of a skull*, they gave etc."

I am aware of the solution which Kuinoel and others of the like opinion give to this passage, and which I presume Mr. Norton must also give, viz., that the explanatory clause was here added by the translator. But as all the passages of this kind stand fully translated in the Peshito; and as we seem to be well entitled to regard the canonical Greek Matthew as having been from the first just what it now is, in every important, and almost in every minute, respect; I feel that this is assuming too much, unless there were some kind of evidence to support it. All the ancient translations we have of the Gospels, are *literal* even to a fault. See the remains of the *Itala*, and compare the Peshito; then read the versions of Irenaeus and of some parts of Origen, which have come down to us. Did the translators take such liberties with their text, as Kuinoel and others bid us believe were taken by the translator of Matthew into Greek? Every one who is conversant with the versions in question, knows well that they did not.

I ask then for some other evidence that this explanatory clause was foisted into the text of the Evangelist, besides that of mere suspicion or conjecture. I regard the clause as thrown in for the sake of readers abroad, whether Jew or Gentile, who were not familiar with Hebrew, and would not know that *Golgotha* meant *skull*.

In the same light must I view the translation of the words *Ἠλί! Ἠλί! λαμὰ σαβαχθανί*; *My God! My God! Why hast thou forsaken me?* Matt. 27: 46. It is impossible that a Hebrew original could have contained such a translation. It was itself more intelligible to its Jewish readers in Palestine, than any version could be.

In Matt. 27: 6 it is said: "And on the morrow, which is

μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν, i. e. *the day after the preparation-day.*" Only readers abroad needed to be told this. The preceding context shews what *morrow* must here mean; and it shews, at the same time, that this *morrow* was μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν. But a foreigner did not know that such was the technical name of this day, and so the Evangelist gives him the name.

In Matt. 28: 15, the writer says: "Then they who received the money, did as they were bidden; and this report was spread abroad, among the Jews, until the present time." The report mentioned was, that the disciples of Jesus had come by night, and taken him away clandestinely from the sepulchre where he was laid. Did a Jew in Palestine, where this report was current and general, need to be gravely told that it was current? A reference to such a thing *en passant*, we might well suppose to be made by Matthew or any other writer. But the communication of this fact as being something unknown to a portion of his readers, we can not well suppose to have been addressed by Matthew to his Palestine friends.

Will it be said, now, in order to avoid the force of this reasoning, that all the references to the Old Testament, the quotations from it, the allusions to the religious opinions, customs, manners, government, natural and artificial objects, etc., of Palestine, imply an apprehension on the part of Matthew that his readers are acquainted with these things, and consequently a conviction that he is addressing his fellow-countrymen at home? The answer is easy. It is just the same in these respects, with all the other Evangelists. They, and Matthew also, knew that their Gospels would go into the hands of Jewish converts abroad, and into the hands of Greeks who were united with them in the same church, and had the same Old Testament Scriptures. They might well take it for granted, that most of these things would be understood in neighbouring countries; and even with respect to those individuals who would not at once understand them, the means of explanation were at hand. Jews were scattered every where, who had been up to Jerusalem to worship, and could give such information as was needed.

If it be again asked, why the author sometimes explains, and at other times does not? The answer is, that he supposes, in some cases, the circumstances to be of such a nature as might have escaped the general notice of foreigners visiting Judea, or of those who lived in its neighbourhood; while in others

he feels that there is no need of explanation on his part. Of this we must concede him to have been a proper judge.

With these internal evidences in view, that Matthew must have intended his Gospel for readers abroad as well as those in Palestine, we should join the consideration of the state of the Jewish nation when he wrote. In all probability his Gospel was written about A. D. 60, when Jewish believers were to be found in all the neighbouring countries, in Egypt, and throughout Asia Minor and Greece. Why should he think of limiting his efforts to propagate a knowledge of Christianity merely to Jews who spoke the Hebrew language?

That Matthew himself was acquainted with the Greek, would follow almost with certainty from the office which he held. Nearly all public officers were chosen from those who could communicate with their fellow men by the use of the Greek language. It was the general medium of official communication. It was at that day, what the French now is, and has for a long time been, in many countries on the continent of Europe.

§ 5. *Was not the Gospel according to the Hebrews itself a TRANSLATION from the Greek Original of Matthew, with interpolations and alterations?*

That this Gospel stood related in some respects to Matthew, is agreed on all hands. Matthew appears to have been its original basis. But that in transcribing, or in translating, it had received many changes, is perfectly clear from the extracts that we have from it, as given us by the Christian fathers. How can these changes be accounted for? Or is it our *canonical* Gospel which has been changed, while the Jewish one remained true to its original archetype? The internal evidence in respect to this question is overwhelming, and entirely satisfactory. The puerile passages in the Gospels according to the Hebrews, which have been exhibited in the preceding pages, shew how entirely incongruous they are with the whole tenor of all the canonical Gospels, and speak for themselves, to the entire conviction of the reader, that they arose from other sources than those of truly evangelical authors.

Besides this, there is, in the few fragments that we meet with in Jerome who translated the Jewish Gospel, and whose testimony can be depended on with respect to the matter before us—there is evidence somewhat striking, that the Nazarene Gospel was rather a *translation* than an original.

In our canonical Matthew 23: 35, we have mention of a 'Zechariah, *the son of Barachias*, slain between the temple and the altar.' This passage has greatly perplexed all commentators, ancient and modern. The difficulty arises from the supposition, that the Zechariah here mentioned, is the one whose martyrdom is recorded in 2 Chron. 24: 20, 21, and who is there called the son of *Jehoiada*. Now this difficulty is removed by the Hebrew Gospel; for, as Jerome testifies in his Commentary on Matthew 23: 25, that Gospel read *the son of Jehoiada*. *Sapit interpretem*—is what seems obvious in this case. The supposition would be quite improbable, that a translator of Matthew from the Hebrew into Greek would introduce the difficulty in question, by inserting *υιου Βαραχίου* instead of *the son of Jehoiada*. Every probability seems to be on the other side. The translator from Greek into Hebrew got rid of the difficulty, by making what he supposed to be a requisite correction of his text, and writing the *son of Jehoiada* instead of *Barachias*.

Again *Βαραββάρ* (Acc. case from *Βαραββᾶς*) is mentioned in Matthew 27: 16. Jerome says (Comm. in loc.), that he found in the Hebrew Gospel, *filius magistri eorum* as the correspondent to this proper name. Now here is evidently a mistake on the part of an interpreter, respecting the etymology of the word *Βαραββάρ*. He supposed it to stand for *בַּר רַבְּהוֹן*, i. e. *the son of their master or teacher*; whereas the plain and proper etymology is *בַּר אָבִי*, *son of our father*. Here we may clearly say: *Sapit interpretem*. If, on the other hand, our Greek Matthew were translated from the Hebrew Gospel, how should the interpreter have fallen upon *Βαραββᾶς* (a proper name) as the equivalent rendering of *בַּר רַבְּהוֹן*, i. e. *filius magistri eorum*?

My own impression, from comparing the specimens transmitted to us by the fathers, in regard to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, is, that this Gospel is plainly and clearly a *secondary* work, a mere *compilation* from the Greek Matthew, with very many interpolations and changes of the original modes of expression, translated into Hebrew for the use of Jewish Churches, and translated after the Jewish converts had separated from the church catholic, and were desirous of something in the way of Scripture which would serve as a rallying-point for their party. Nothing can be more certain than that the Gospel in question *Judaizes*. It was composed, or rather

compiled, then, by some Judaizing teacher or writer, who took Matthew for his basis, because he was thought to have said nothing which would bring into particular disrepute a zeal for the ceremonial law of Moses, and because he was long conversant with the Palestine converts, after the death of Jesus.

One thing, at all events, is quite certain; and this is of great consequence in the matter before us. It is certain, that all the knowledge we have of the ancient Hebrew Gospel, is such as obliges us to believe, that it was a spurious Gospel, filled with interpolations, some of which are so weak and silly as to furnish conclusive evidence from their very nature, that they belong to no genuine Gospel. It is certain that the earliest notices we have of the state of this Gospel, all conspire to force upon our minds the same conclusion.

As we know, then, but of one Hebrew Gospel among the ancients, (some small differences probably existed between that of the Ebionites and Nazarenes, and yet Epiphanius and Jerome expressly declare that the Gospel of both sects was substantially the same), and as we do know for certainty that this was palpably an adulterated, interpolated, and sectarian Gospel—why should we persist in maintaining that the original Gospel of Matthew was *Hebrew*? That such report was common among the fathers, I fully acknowledge. But I have shown how this could easily be transmitted, as it was, and yet, under the circumstances in which they were, neither their integrity or veracity be impeached, even when we withhold our credit from their testimony. Only two of them were capable of examining a *Hebrew* Gospel, and those two have given us extracts which show at once that such Gospel was a spurious one; and in addition to this they have explicitly told us, that they do not regard that Gospel as of any binding authority. Then the amount of all we know of the Gospel under examination is to its *discredit*; and when also the amount of testimony in this respect is very considerable, comprising many passages especially in Epiphanius and Jerome, so that we have somewhat ample means of judging; why should we affirm, in the face of all this, that there was a Hebrew Gospel entitled to more credit than our canonical Matthew? For such must be the case, if our Matthew is but a translation from a Hebrew Original. The incongruity of such conclusions with such testimony and such facts—is palpable, when the matter is seriously and fully examined.

§ 6. Conclusion.

It is some years since I began to suspect the common mode of reasoning in respect to a *Hebrew* original of Matthew ; although the confidence reposed in it appeared to be so unwavering on the part of many writers. Every fresh investigation has served to increase my doubts ; and they are now so strong, that I am forced to regard the assumption of a Hebrew original as improbable in itself, and as altogether incapable of being established by satisfactory proof.

We may, on an impartial review of the whole case, say truly, that there are difficulties on both sides of the question. How can we dispose of the declarations of the Fathers ? This is one difficulty. I have endeavoured to shew how we can dispose of them, with entire respect to their integrity, and without impeachment of their understanding. What Papias said at an early period, passed current afterwards ; not simply on his authority, but on the ground that it was countenanced or supported by the testimony of the Judaizing Christians. Irenaeus, who cherished a high respect for Papias, received his views, we can hardly doubt, from that writer, in respect to a Hebrew Matthew. If Eusebius did not the same, still we can easily account for his speaking as he does, on the ground of tradition and of reports derived from the Nazarenes and Ebionites. And so in the case of others. Most plainly and palpably the great body of the fathers, in this case, are *hors du combat* as to any ability to testify from personal knowledge or examination. Such as had ability to examine, renounced the authority of the Hebrew Gospel ; and these same fathers have given us extracts enough from it to show, that they did this with good and sufficient reason. In a word, all the testimony derived from actual knowledge of the Gospel in Hebrew, does nothing but show that it was a spurious, interpolated Gospel ; in many respects, indeed, having a resemblance to our Matthew, in many others differing widely and even offensively from him. Is it not time for critics to cease from eulogizing and defending such a Gospel ?

On the other hand, the facts adduced in the preceding pages can never be well accounted for, on the supposition of a genuine Hebrew original extant in the 2nd, 3d, and 4th centuries. They are incompatible with such a state of things ; and therefore such a state is incredible. The facts cannot be denied.

They are not matters of conjecture or uncertainty. The internal state of the Gospel itself proclaims, that the writer had foreigners in his eye when he composed it. How can a Hebrew original be admitted under such circumstances, and in spite of all these difficulties? I cannot deem it probable; I must believe, that our canonical Matthew came from the hands of its author as it now is, with the exception of some slight variations in its readings occasionally, which are not of sufficient importance to affect in any degree worth naming the question before us.

I cannot even go with Bengel, who, moved by some of the difficulties that I have suggested, says: "Quid obstat, quo minus idem [Matthaeus] Graece eundem librum eodem exemplo scripserit?" He means to say, that it is not improbable that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally, both in Greek and Hebrew, on the same exemplar; so that both Jews and Greeks could avail themselves of it. Of the like opinion was Dr. Townson of England; and Guerike of Halle has also recently published similar views. But there is no example of any thing like this, in respect to the Old Testament or the New. The books of Ezra and Daniel, a mixture of Chaldee and Hebrew, still never exhibit the same matter in both languages.

The Epistle to the Hebrews even, was not written in Hebrew. The labour would have been superfluous.

Doubtless the three critics above mentioned were moved with the difficulties attending the supposition of an exclusive Hebrew original, on the one hand, and on the other they do not seem to have been satisfied how the testimony of the fathers could be disposed of without impeaching their credit. Hence they made a conjecture which seemed to reconcile both opinions in relation to our subject. It is possible they may be in the right. Yet when we consider, that all the testimony we have of a Hebrew original goes to prove this to have been a spurious and interpolated Matthew, why need we be anxious in regard to this testimony? It shows indeed that there was, quite early, a so called Hebrew Gospel *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*; it shews that the Nazarenes and Ebionites claimed this as coming from the apostle Matthew; but all this may be admitted, and yet an original Hebrew Gospel actually written by this apostle, be very reasonably doubted. The origin of a *Greek version*, from an unknown author, and at an unknown time—a version of such a book as this—buried in such inexplicable obscurity,

is a problem that cannot be satisfactorily solved. Still less can the conduct of the fathers be accounted for, who never once thought of appealing to the Hebrew Gospel as a document of authority.

I cannot therefore admit the currency of such a Gospel—not even along with a Greek copy. The conduct of the church catholic is utterly inexplicable, when this is once admitted.

I must come, therefore, to a conclusion quite different from that of Mr. Norton, in respect to the original language of Matthew's Gospel. Quite as wide apart we are, also, in respect to the *genuineness* of Matthew I. II. The question respecting these chapters, however, remains yet to be discussed. After the preceding disquisition, it may occupy perhaps less time and room than the first question has occupied. But it is time to close our discussion for the present; the remaining topic of inquiry must be reserved for a future number of this work.

ARTICLE VII.

WHAT WERE THE VIEWS ENTERTAINED BY THE EARLY REFORMERS, ON THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION, FAITH, AND THE ACTIVE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST.

By Rev. R. W. Landis, Jeffersonville, Pa. [Continued from Vol. XI. p. 481.]

§ II. *Views entertained by the Reformers on the subject of Faith.*

It is contended by some that it is an essential departure from the principles of the Reformation to maintain that faith is simply an act of the mind, and is itself imputed for righteousness.*

* The *fourth* charge of Dr. Junkin against Mr. Barnes is, "Mr. Barnes teaches that faith is an act of the mind and not a principle, and is itself imputed for righteousness:" in support of which he quotes from "*Notes on Romans*" p. 94, 95. To give the reader an idea of the strong points of the evidence we subjoin a part of Dr. Junkin's summary, viz. "Mr Barnes says, 'the strong act of Abraham's faith.' He could not write without contradicting his own doctrine. What sense is in the phrase, 'the strong act of Abraham's act of the mind?' It is impossible to introduce this definition of his

The reader by consulting the note in the margin, will perceive the true state of the case, and render it unnecessary for us in this place to be more particular in our allusions. We will proceed to examine what were the views of the Reformation on the points here in controversy.

[*“faith is always an act of the mind”*], without multiplying most strange and unmeaning expressions. If ‘faith is always an act of the mind,’ and ‘not a principle’ of action, who can explain the phrase ‘an act of faith?’ 3. If ‘faith is an act of the mind only,’ and not a principle of grace in the soul, from which the acts proceed, *then it must follow that Abraham was justified by an act of his mind, which ‘was as much his own act as any act of obedience to the law.’ Here it is indubitably taught, that the individual, personal act of Abraham’s mind is the ground of his justification before God.* Not the righteousness of the Saviour, as the church has always believed, but the *act of the man himself* was imputed to him for righteousness. ‘*The word it,*’ says Mr. Barnes, ‘*here evidently refers to the act of believing.* It does not refer to the righteousness of another—of God, or of the Messiah.’ Now it is righteousness which justifies—when a man has the righteousness required by the law, he must and will be justified by the judge. ‘If, therefore, Abraham’s act is his own righteousness—is the ground and cause of his being justified—he is not justified by Christ’s merits at all, but by his own act.—Oh, sir, how difficult it is to get clear of the doctrine of imputed righteousness!’ etc. etc. See “*Vindication*,” pp. 55, 56.

In relation to this charge Mr. Barnes thus replies: “this charge consists of three counts, or specifications, which it is necessary to dispose of in their order. The first is, that ‘faith is an act of the mind;’ the proof is on p. 94. In regard to this position of the charge, I admit that I meant to teach, as charged that ‘faith is always an act of the mind.’ And the meaning is so obvious, that it scarcely requires elucidation. I designed to teach that it is not a created essence independent of the soul; and that there was nothing in faith which could not appropriately be described by the mind *receiving*, and *resting* on Christ; *exercising* confidence in him; *believing* his promises, *fearing* his threatenings, and *depending* on him for salvation; all which are *actings* of the mind, or are the mind *acting*. And I do not wish to be understood now as holding any thing on this point different from that which is here charged upon me.—The second count in the charge is, ‘that faith is not a principle.’ In the passage referred to in the Notes as proof, this is expressly stated as my belief, that faith is not a principle. By this I meant to affirm that it was not any thing *independent* of the acting of the mind; any created or conceivable essence of the soul that was lying back of the act of believing.—The third specification in this

The writer had read considerably in the older divines, when this controversy was approximating its height ; and was surprised at the objections made to the views above stated, and the consequences attempted to be deduced from them. It is a singular fact that these very objections might be urged with equal, if not greater force against such men as *Martin Luther* and *Francis Gomar*. As these two divines have treated especially on this topic, and as they have ever been regarded fair representatives of the orthodox doctrine, we shall quote them at some length on this topic. Let us hear

I. LUTHER. In the second volume of his works (the *Nürimberg edition*, printed A. D. 1550,) when treating upon Gen. 15: 6, he thus remarks : “ Paul has fully established this as the sentiment of the whole Scriptures ; a sentiment so hateful and yet so formidable to the gates of hell, *that all who believe what God has spoken are righteous*. I shall not therefore darken so illustrious an exposition [of Gen. 15: 6] with any thing that I can offer. I shall therefore be brief. Read Paul, and read him with attention, and you will perceive that from this place he erects that chief article of our faith, so intolerable to the world and to Satan, *that faith alone can justify ; and that faith is to assent to the Divine promises, and to decide that they are true*. From this foundation the author of the epistle to the Hebrews skilfully comprehends in the article faith the achievements of all the saints and affirms that all these things were done by faith. For without faith it is impossible to please God ; and God, when he promises any thing, requires that we believe it, that is, we conclude it to be true by faith, and doubt not that the event will answer to the promise. If you inquire, therefore, whether before this period Abraham

charge is, that I have taught, that ‘ faith itself is imputed for righteousness.’ In regard to this I observe, 1. that so far as I am able to understand the Apostle Paul, this is his very language and sense—Rom. 4: 3, ‘ Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him (or imputed *ἡλογισθη*,) for righteousness.’ The word ‘ it ’ in our translation, I understand as referring, unquestionably, to the act of Abraham’s mind ; since his strong act of faith was the subject, and the only subject of discussion. That it should refer to any thing else, seemed to me a departure from all the proper laws of interpretation.

—5. By being justified by faith, it is meant, that we are treated as righteous—that we are forgiven,—that we are admitted to the favor of God, and treated as his friends.” *Defence*, pp. 160, 161, 166, 167.

were righteous, I answer, *he was righteous because he believed God.* This indeed the Spirit here wished to be plainly testified (because the promise is in relation to the spiritual seed, as is evident,) that they who embrace this seed, or those who believe in Jesus Christ, are righteous. *Faith was strong in Abraham,* when, being commanded, he left his country and wandered about in exile. But we are not all required to do the same thing: and hence he does not at that time add, *Abraham believed God* and it was accounted to him for righteousness; but he adds it here in this place when he speaks of the heavenly seed; in order that the church in all ages might be confirmed. *Because they, who, with Abraham, believe this promise, are truly righteous.* The Holy Ghost wished to express this, in its own appropriate place clearly and unequivocally, *that righteousness is nothing but to believe the promises of God.*"*

"How therefore did Abraham obtain righteousness? *In this way alone, God spake, and he believed God speaking.*

* "Hoc vero est apostolice tractare scripturas, et statuere illam universalem sententiam ipsis inferorum portis formidabilem et invisam, quod omnes qui credunt verbo Dei, sunt justi. Ne igitur optimum interpretaem meis disputationibus obscurem, brevius hic ero. Vos Paulum legite, et legite attentissime, et videbitis ex hoc loco extruere eum praecipuum nostrae fidei articulum, mundum et Satanæ intolerabilem, quod sola fides justificet. Fidem autem esse promissionibus divinis assentiri, et statuere quod verae sint. Ex hoc fundamento author epistolae ad Hebraeos, erudite omnium sanctorum res gestas includit in fidem, et dicit, ex fide ab eis gesta esse omnia. Sine fide enim impossibile est placere Deo, et Deus cum promittit aliquid, hoc exigit, ut id credamus, hoc est, ut verum esse fide statuamus, nec dubitemus eventum responsurum promissioni. Si interroges igitur an Abraham ante hoc tempus fuerit justus. Respondeo fuit justus quia credidit Deo. Hic autem diserte id Spiritus Sanctus testari voluit, quia promissio est de spirituali semine, ut recta consequentia statuas, amplectentes hoc semen, seu credentes in Christum esse justos. Fuit fides in Abraha eximia, cum jussus deserit patriam, et se exilio committit. Sed non omnes jubemur idem facere: Ideo tum non addit, credidit Abraham Deo, et reputatum est ei ad justitiam. Hic autem addit cum de coelesti semine loquitur, ad ecclesiam omnium temporum confirmandum: quod qui cum Abraha huic promissioni credunt, vere sunt justi. Hanc sententiam in hoc tanquam maxime proprio loco voluit Spiritus Sanctus diserte et clare proponere, quod justitia nihil sit, nisi credere promittenti Deo." *Ut supra, p. 55, 56.*

But the Holy Spirit appears, (a witness worthy of belief,) and affirms that *this believing, or this faith itself is righteousness. Or that it is by God himself imputed for righteousness, and that it is regarded as righteousness.* But because the words which the Lord speaks, especially concern the spiritual seed, Christ; Paul unfolds this mystery, and openly declares that righteousness is by faith in Christ. In this doctrine, therefore, we acquiesce, nor can we suffer ourselves to be driven from it by the ravings of the devil, or of popes. One proof that *Satan hates this doctrine* is, that not only in our time does he with the greatest hostility contend against it, and impudently blaspheme and condemn it through his popish satellites; but the Jewish rabbins here also make known their folly and the furious hatred which they bear to Christ. For they read this place as follows: Abraham believed in God and thought to him in righteousness: that is, he believed the Lord, and thought that he was righteous, and that he would grant to him a seed because he was righteous: that is, because he regarded the merits and holiness of father Abraham: an idea that is truly worthy of rabbins and enemies of Christ. For in this manner the whole doctrine is reversed; the promise and the grace is excluded, and human righteousness established; when Paul from this very place earnestly opposes this same sentiment as both false and impious.

“About the word *חָשַׁב*, I shall not much contend; for whether you understand it as signifying *to account*, or *to esteem*, it amounts to the same. For when the Divine Being thinks of me that I am righteous, that my sins are forgiven, that I am freed from eternal death, and I, with thankfulness apprehend, as a matter of faith, this thought of God concerning me, *truly I am righteous; not indeed by my own works, but by that faith by which I apprehend the divine thought.* For the thought of God is infallible truth: *therefore when I lay hold on it, with a strong exercise of will*, (not with a vague and doubtful opinion,) *I am righteous.* For faith's a sure and certain belief, or confidence concerning God, that through Christ he is propitious, —that through Christ he thinks thoughts of peace concerning us, and not thoughts of affliction or of anger. For the thought or promise of God, and the faith by which I lay hold on that promise are related to each other. Paul therefore rightly translates the verb (*חָשַׁב*) by the verb, *λογίζεσθαι*; because it also alludes to the thought as being a verb of accounting. For

if you will believe the promises made by God, God will account you righteous." *

"He therefore who believes God promising, who feels that he is true, and that he will perform whatever he has promised, *such an one is righteous, or accounted so. Faith most assuredly is nothing more, nor is it possible for it to be any thing more than assent to the promise. And if this assent is counted for righteousness, why does the insane sophist assert that it is love, hope, and other virtues? Faith alone lays hold*

* "Quomodo igitur acquisivit justitiam? Hoc solo modo, Quod Deus loquitur, et Abraham loquenti Deo credit. Accedit autem Spiritus Sanctus, testis fide dignus, et affirmat hoc ipsum credere, seu hanc ipsam fidem, esse justitiam, seu imputari ab ipso Deo pro justitia, et haberi pro justitia. Quia autem verba quae Dominus loquitur, praecipue respiciunt semen spirituale, Christum: evolvit Paulus mysterium hoc, et clare pronunciat justitiam esse per fidem in Christum. In hac igitur sententia acquiescamus, nec ab ea dimoveri nos furoribus Satanae et Pontificum sinamus. Argumento autem est quam Satan hanc sententiam oderit, quod non solum hodie per Pontificias larvas, sic eam hostiliter impugnat, et impudenter blasphematur, ac damnat. Sed Rabbinum Judaeorum hic quoque suam stultitiam, et furoribus suum, quem contra Christum habent, patefaciunt. Sic enim hunc locum legunt: Credidit Abraham in Deo, et cogitavit ei in justitia, hoc est Abraham credidit Domino, et cogitavit Deum esse justum et daturum ei semen, quia sit justus, hoc est, quia respiciat merita et sanctitatem patris Abraham. Digna profecto Rabbinis et hostibus Christi cogitatio. Hoc enim modo tota sententia invertitur, excluditur promissio et gratia, ac stabilitur justitia humana: cum Paulus ex hoc ipso loco gravissimo eam sententiam, tanquam falsam et impiam, oppugnet. De verbo עָשָׂה non valde repugno, sive id pro reputare sive cogitare accipias, nam res eodem redit. Cum enim divina majestas de me cogitet, me esse justum, mihi esse remissa peccata, me liberum esse a morte aeterna, et ego cum gratiarum actione in fide hanc cogitationem Dei de me apprehendo, vere sum justus, non meis operibus, sed fide qua apprehendo cogitationem divinam. Nam Dei cogitatio est infallibilis veritas. Igitur cum eam apprehendo, firma cogitatione, non vaga opinione et dubia, justus sum. Fides est enim firma et certa seu cogitatio seu fiducia de Deo, quod per Christum sit propitius, quod per Christum cogitet de nobis cogitationes pacis, non afflictionis aut irae. Relativa enim haec sunt, cogitatio Dei, seu promissio, et fides qua promissionem Dei apprehendo. Recte igitur Paulus, verbum עָשָׂה reddidit per verbum λογίζομαι quod etiam ad cogitationem alludit, sicut reputandi verbum. Si enim tu Deo promittenti credis, Deus te reputat justum." *Ibid.* p. 56.

on the promise ; it believes in the promises of God ; it stretches forth its hand to God who is offering something, and receives it. This is the appropriate work of faith alone. This is the clear and indubitable testimony of Scripture, that the righteousness of faith is imputed, i. e. that Abraham believing in God is reputed by God as righteous. This the Scripture says not of works. Let this distinction, therefore, be observed, that faith which contracts with God promising, and accepts his promise, *that alone justifies*. The difference, therefore, of the faith of Abraham and of our faith is nothing but this ; Abraham believed in Christ to be exhibited, and we believe in him already exhibited. *And by this faith we all are justified*. The whole matter consists in this, that Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness ; *that is, he was by believing made righteous and an heir of eternal life.*"*

We have been thus particular, lest it should be suspected that we have misrepresented the doctrine of this great reformer. Let his views be compared with those, against which so serious exception has been taken, and it will be perceived that the rejection of either, must be followed by the rejection of both. The views of Luther, however, on the subject of justification and faith, cannot be consistently rejected by Calvinists.

II. Our second witness shall be the Augsburg Confession. This celebrated symbol was prepared for the purpose of making known to Europe the doctrines of the Reformation ; and also to correct the flagrant misrepresentation and calumny

* "Qui igitur promittenti Deo credit, qui sentit eum esse veracem, et esse praestitutum quicquid promiserit, hic est justus, seu reputatur justus.—Profecto fides aliud nihil est, nec aliud potest, quam assentiri promissioni. Si autem hic assensus reputatur pro justitia, cur insane sophista, asseris dilectionem, spem, et alias virtutes.—Sola autem fides apprehendit promissionem, credit promittenti Deo, Deo porrigente aliquid admovet manum, et id accipit. Hoc proprium solius fidei opus est.—Scripturae autem testimonium hic clarum et indubitatum est, quod fidei imputatur justitia, hoc est, quod Deo credens Abraham, reputatur a Deo justus : Hoc non pronunciat Scriptura de operibus.—Retinenda igitur distinctio haec est, quod fides quae agit cum Deo promittente, et ejus promissionem accipit, haec sola justificat.—Differentia igitur fidei Abrahae et nostrae nulla alia est, nisi quod Abraham credidit in Christum exhibendum, nos credimus in exhibitum jam. Et illa fide justificamur omnes.—Tota res in eo consistit, quod Abraham Deo credidit, et reputatum est ei ad justitiam, hoc est, quod credendo factus est justus, et haeres aeterni regni." *Vide ut Supra*, pp. 57, 58.

which the papists had circulated respecting them. It is the joint production of Luther, Melancthon, Bugenhagen, and Jonas, who were appointed by the elector of Saxony to draw up a sketch of their doctrines to lay before the emperor Charles V. at Augsburg. For he had commanded the convention of a diet at this place, for the purpose of terminating the disputes between the Pope and the princes who favored the Reformation. It was held June 25, *anno* 1530. The fourth article is on the subject of justification, and thus reads: * “The churches teach that men cannot be justified before God, by their own strength, merits or works; but that they are justified for Christ’s sake, *when they believe themselves to be received into favor*, and their sins forgiven on account of Christ, who by his death made satisfaction for our sins. *This faith God imputes to us for righteousness.*” The reader cannot but be struck with the similiarity between the language of this article on this subject, and the language of Luther above quoted.

III. During the preceding year was held the *Colloquium Marpurgense*, in whose *Acts* are contained the sentiments of *Luther, Zuinglius*, and their followers. The reader will bear in mind that the object of this *colloquium* was to settle articles of peace and union among the reformers. We will now listen to its testimony. “We believe that we shall be delivered from this original sin, and from all other sins, and from eternal death, if we believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God who died for us. Without this faith there is no kind of works, or condition, or religion, etc. that can absolve us from a single sin. • We believe that this faith is the gift of God; and that we cannot acquire it by any preceding works, or merits, nor can we obtain it by any exertions of our own; but that it is created and bestowed by the Holy Spirit, even as he wills when we hear the gospel or word of Christ. *We believe that this faith is our righteousness before God.*” *

* For the original Latin, see Note Vol. XI. p. 467.

† “V. Credimus, nos ab hoc peccato (originali,) aliisque omnibus peccatis et ab aeterna morte liberari, si credamus in Filium Dei IESUM CHRISTUM pro nobis mortuum: absque hac fide nullo operum genere, conditione, vel religione, etc. ab ullo peccato absolvi posse. VI. Hujusmodi fidem esse donum Dei, quod nullis praecedentibus operibus vel meritis a nobis acquiri, aut viribus nostris parari possit: Sed Spiritum Sanctum eam largiri et creare, prout vult in cordibus nostris quando Evangelium seu verbum Christi audimus. VII. Hanc fidem esse justitiam nostram coram Deo,” etc.

IV. *The Confession of Bohemia.* We have not the original of this Confession, and shall therefore quote it from a translation. "Now this faith, (viz. justifying faith,) is properly *an assent of a willing heart to the whole truth delivered in the gospel*, whereby man is enlightened in his mind and soul," etc.

V. *Moravian Confession*, Art. IV. "We likewise teach, that we cannot attain to the forgiveness of sins and righteousness before God, through our own merit, work, or satisfaction; but that we obtain pardon of sins and are made righteous before God, by grace, for Christ's sake *through faith, even by believing that Christ hath suffered for us*; and that for his sake sin is forgiven us, and righteousness and eternal life bestowed upon us. *For it is this faith, which God will account and impute for righteousness before him*, as St. Paul says to the Romans, in the third and fourth chapters."

VI. *Cloppenburg*, a learned and acute theologian, (but he flourished later than any we have yet quoted,) after remarking that, "Justification in the Scriptures signifies absolution from the guilt of sins,"* distinctly states that "it is a problem among the orthodox," (*problema est inter orthodoxos*), whether justifying faith is to be predicated of the intellect or will. It is worthy of remark too that this eminent divine (whose only fault was, he was too disputatious), the annihilator of *Bedell* and *Smalcius*, and the companion of *Spanheim*, of *Polyander*, of *Triglandius*, and *Rivet*, and others who were alike the glory of the church and of the age, should pronounce the doctrine of *Luther* and *Melancthon* on the very topics before us, "*the orthodox doctrine*" (*orthodoxam doctrinam*). Thus showing that on this subject, to quote a primitive Lutheran reformer is equivalent to quoting a strict Calvinist.

VII. *Tilenus*. "When justification is passively understood, its form is nothing else than the application of faith; *whence faith is said to be our righteousness*."†

VIII. *Gomar*. For reasons already stated, our quotations from this eminent Calvinist will be extensive. For as in the case of *Luther*, so here, we wish to present his views in full, upon each topic embraced in the objection referred to.

Treating upon the nature of faith he thus remarks: "That,

* "Justificationem in sacris literis significare absolutionem a reatu peccatorum, credimus." *Opp. Alt. Tom.* p. 394.

† "Passive cum sumitur justificatio, forma ejus nihil aliud est, quam fidei applicatio, unde fides dicitur justitia nostra." *Syntag. Par. II. Loc. XLII. De Just. Thes. VIII. p. 724.*

whose subject is the intellect, and not the will alone, that, properly, is not confidence. But the subject of faith is the intellect and not the will only. *Therefore faith is not properly confidence.* The proposition is true, because, by universal consent, confidence is not in the intellect but in the will alone; because by itself it is an emotion, an affection of the heart and will, and thus it is defined by every one. But it is a contradiction to affirm that a thing is in the intellect and not in the will alone, and at the same time that it is not in the intellect but only in the will. The assumption is true, beyond all controversy. For although it remain a question whether faith is partly in the intellect and partly in the will, it is yet by universal consent, from the general definition of faith, and from the sacred Scriptures, acknowledged, that faith is in the intellect, and not in the will alone. Wherefore, the conclusion necessarily follows from the admitted proposition and assumption, *that faith is not confidence.** With the *premises* of this argument we have nothing to do. The *conclusion* to which Gomar arrived was that justifying faith is purely an intellectual exercise.

Again. "The same thing concerning confidence is not obscurely signified by some celebrated theologians, who, however, in their definition of faith and confidence assert that the faith by which we are justified is confidence. An illustrious example of this may be found in Dr. Ursinus, in that eminent work of his, the Explanation of the Catechism, which is well known to every one. After a common place exposition of faith, he, in the sixth thesis of those adjoining it defines faith as follows: '*Justifying faith is a notion by which one firmly assents to all things made known to him in the word of God, and concludes*

* "Cujus subjectum est intellectus, non autem sola voluntas; illud proprie non est fiducia. Atqui fidei subjectum est intellectus, non autem sola voluntas. Ergo fides non est proprie fiducia. Propositio vera est, quia omnium consensu fiducia non est intellectu, sed in sola voluntate; quia per se motus, atque affectus cordis, ac voluntatis est, atque ita ab omnibus definitur. Contradictoria autem sunt manifesta, idem esse in intellectu, non autem in sola voluntate: et simul non esse in intellectu, sed in sola voluntate. Assumptio etiam est vera, citra ullam controversiam. Nam licet quaestio sit, an fides sit partim in intellectu; partim in voluntate: illud tamen, omnium consensu, ex Scriptura, et generali fidei significatione, notum est: fidem esse in intellectu, non autem in sola voluntate. Quare conclusio, necessario, ex vera propositione, et assumptione sequitur: *fidem non esse fiduciam.*" Vide Opp. Dr. F. Gomari, Tom. I. p. 655. in folio

that the promise of the favor of God for Christ's sake, belongs to himself. And the confidence in this favor of God towards himself overcomes all fear and sorrow. Here, as others are accustomed to do, he plainly allows that there are two parts of justifying faith: the first he places in a notion of the word of God, to which he particularly refers, to determine that the promise of grace belongs to himself. He also distinctly subjoins another, to wit, confidence in this favor, or grace. The same further appears from the next sentence of the following thesis, in which he describes this confidence in the following manner: *For the confidence in justifying faith is an emotion of the will and heart, consisting of joy because of the knowledge of the present favor of God towards us, and hope of a future liberation from all evils.* But I affirm that the faith by which we are justified is not composed of this joy and hope. *Therefore the faith by which we are justified is not that confidence.* This appears," etc.*.

We shall now hear his criticism on the same passage upon which we quoted *Luther* so largely: "*And Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness.*"

* "Idemque de fiducia, a magnis theologis, qui tamen fidem, per quam justificamur, fiduciam esse tradunt, in definitione fidei et fiducia, non obscure significatur. Cujus rei exemplum illustre, in egregio illo, quod omnium pene manibus teritur, explicationum Catecheticarum D. Zachariae Ursini, edito opere, post locum communem de fide expositum, in thesibus de ea subnexis: thesi enim sexta, fides ita definitur: *Fides justificans est notitia qua quis firmiter assentitur omnibus in verbo Dei sibi patefactis, et statuit, promissionem gratiae Dei, propter Christum ad se pertinere: et fiducia hujus favoris Dei erga se, omnem tristitiam et metum superat:* Ubi duas manifeste, ut et alii solent, fidei justificantis partes ponit. I. Notitiam verbi Dei, ad quam refert peculiariter, statuere promissionem gratiae ad se pertinere: ac distincte alteram subjicit, nimirum fiduciam favoris illius, hoc est gratiae. Idemque ex hypothesi, seu sententia proxime sequentis thesisi septimae confirmatur: qua fiduciam illam, hoc modo, describit: *Est enim fiducia fidei justificantis motus voluntatis, et cordis, compositus ex laetitia, propter certitudinem praesentis gratiae Dei erga nos; et spe futurae liberationis ab omnibus malis.* Atqui, inquam, fides, per quam justificamur, non est composita ex laetitia praesentis gratiae Dei erga nos; et spe futurae liberationis ab omnibus malis. Ergo fides per quam justificamur, non est fiducia illa. Assumptio patet: quia illa duo, laetitia et spe, sunt effecta fidei justificantis: quemadmodum in antecedente loco communi de fide, etc. etc." *Vide ut supra, p. 656.*

“Besides,” says he, “for the active verb which Moses uses, to wit, *imputed*, read *God imputed*; for which Paul has it in the passive form, *it was imputed*, to wit, *by God*. There is a little change, to be sure, in the phraseology, but the sentiment remains unchanged, as verse 6 also declares. As it is certain from Moses that *τοῦτο this*, refers to the faith of Abraham, a question arises as to *what is signified by this word? and what did he intend to ascribe to him?* (It was counted to him for righteousness.) In answer then to the former question we remark, that *some understand that word, and properly, to refer to faith*; and *others improperly understand it to refer to Christ, or rather to the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith*. They think that faith is here to be understood metonymically for its object; as the word hope, is often used for the thing hoped for. So they think that faith is here employed for the thing believed in by faith. Nevertheless, *in this diversity of sentiment, even among the orthodox, the former of these views is evidently the genuine one*. It so appears from the preceding declaration. ‘Abraham believed God, and this, to wit, the *believing, that is, the faith by which he believed, was imputed to him for righteousness*. For the pronoun *τοῦτο* or *it*, cannot in this place be otherwise understood. Neither the truth of the Scriptures, nor the context at all militate against this construction.

“What Arminius, in his epistle to Hippolytes, contends for, to wit, that faith ought here to be understood, and not the righteousness of Christ; thus far he does not speak improperly, as appears from what has been offered above. But the reason which he adduces in proof of it is false, etc. etc.”*

* “Praeterea pro activo verbo, quo utitur Moses, nempe *imputavit* supple Deus, de quo in antecedentibus sermo, Paulus habet passive *imputatum est*, scilicet, a Deo, vocis aliqua mutatione, sed eadem tamen manente sententia: ut ver. 6 etiam declaratur. Siquidem cum certum sit ea Mose, subjectum esse *τοῦτο hoc*, nempe credere seu fidem Abrahami: quaestio oritur, quid hac voce significetur: et quid attributum, (*imputatum est ei ad justitiam*,) sibi velit.

“Ad prius, nempe fidem, quod attinet, quidam accipiunt proprie eam vocem: alii vero improprie, pro Christo, aut potius pro justitia Christi fide apprehensa, per metonymiam adjuncti, pro suo objecto: quemadmodum spes pro re sperata nonnunquam usurpatur: sic etiam consentiunt, fidem pro re fide credita, hoc in loco, usurpari.

“Veruntamen in hac sententiarum diversitate, etiam inter orthodoxos, priorem genuinam esse, apparet, ex prima atque antecedente

Dr. Pareus has the very same criticism on this passage : * and yet this criticism has been objected to as discriminating Pelagians, and Arminians from Calvinists.

We had *Scultetus* marked for quotation, on the subject of faith, but shall omit his testimony, in order to introduce a matter in relation to the question before us, that ought to be most seriously considered by those who are engaged in existing controversies.

The reader has observed that both Cloppenburg and Gomar speak of a difference of sentiment on the subject of faith, prevailing *among the orthodox*, (*inter orthodoxos* is the expression employed by both.) Now this difference which then existed, and which then proved not that either side were heretics, is in our time considered, by some as utterly incompatible with Calvinistic soundness. The view which *Luther* and *Gomar* so nobly contended for, with multitudes of other eminent divines, is now repudiated as Arminianism and heresy. But the truth is that the followers of Arminius originally opposed the doctrine of *Luther* and *Gomar* ; † though the views which they embraced are now advocated as orthodox.

assertione ; credidit Abraham Deo, et hoc, nempe credere, id est, fides illa, qua credidit, imputatum est ei ad justitiam : nam pronomen τοῦτο, seu illud, non potest aliter hoc loco accipi, (quam vox antecedens, ad quam refertur, et cujus loco, pro natura pronominis, elegantiae causa, ponitur : deinde a propria significatione ad impropriam, atque inusitatam) in Sacra Scriptura non est recedendum, nisi necessitas seu veritas Scripturae, aut loci circumstantiae hoc flagitent, ut extra controversiam est : atqui in hac sententia Pauli, nec veritas illius, neque circumstantiae loci id flagitant : quia attributum illud, imputatum est ei ad justitiam, hoc non requirit : nam vera est assertio servata subjecti, nempe fidei propria significatione, neque ulla circumstantia hujus loci repugnat.

“Quod vero Arminius in epistola ad Hippolytum, legatum Palatinum, contendit, fidem proprie debere accipi, non autem improprie pro justitia Christi : hactenus non mali loquitur, ut ex antecedentibus patet : sed ratio, quam illi rei probandae adducit, falsa est, etc. etc.” *ut sup.* Vol. I. 396, 397.

* See *Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos*, by David Pareus. Opp. Parei, Vol. I. Part III. p. 103. and Part I. p. 192.

† We could multiply quotations, but the following will suffice : “Est autem fides in Christum assensus fiducialis Evangelio adhibitus, quo argumentis sive extrinsecis, sive ipsi Evangelio insitis persuasus, statuo vera esse omnia ea, quae Evangelio continentur, inque Deo per

The fact is that there then existed among the orthodox, the same difference on the subject of faith, that now exists between the contending parties in the community referred to. Yet they lived in peace and harmony, and considered each other as sound in their views.

We have seen then how expressly Luther, Gomar, and others have maintained that *faith is not confidence*, and that "*it is, and can be, nothing more than assent,*" or *belief of the promises*: We shall now introduce on the subject the views of a few other men, who have ever been reputed equally orthodox.

We begin with *Dr. Pareus*. In his *Anatomy of Arminianism* he says: "To believe, is with us, not only to assent to the whole word of God; but particularly and properly to confide in the promise of the gospel concerning grace and forgiveness of sins for the sake of the blood of Christ. Mark 5: 26, *only believe*; here it is used for *confide*. And especially hath it this sense in the phrases *to believe in God, in Christ*, etc. John. 14: 1, *If ye believe in God, believe also in me*; that is, put your *trust* also in me; for here he comforts his apostles. John. 9: 36, *Who is the Lord that I may believe in him?*—for that I may *confide* in him. *Saving faith* is with us united with confidence in the promise of the gospel, or of the promised mercy of God, by the forgiveness of sins, for the sake of the blood of Christ. So that when we say, (Rom. 3: 28,) that *we are justified by faith, faith signifies confidence; and to be justified by faith is to be absolved from sin by confidence in the merit of Christ*. This is the sense of the apostle when he says, (Rom. 3: 25,) 'whom God hath set forth as an atonement through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness by the forgiveness of sins, that are past.' Here *faith in his blood* cannot signify any thing but *confidence* in the blood of Christ. But they who understand *faith* only of assent, and *to believe* only for *to assent*, show by this that they would render John 3: 36, *ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ they who do not believe the Son, by they who do not assent to the Son: etc.*"*

Christum confido et acquiesco. Bague Fides non est notitia nuda eorum quae Evangelio continentur," etc. *Disput. Episcopii, Par. III. Disput. XV. Thea. III. and IV.*

* *Nobis credere, est non tantum omni verbo Dei assentiri, sed praecipue et propria promissione Evangelii de gratia et remissione peccor-*

Our next witness shall be *Wendeline*. "Faith, in its form consists of three parts, *notion*, *assent*, and *confidence*. *Confidence* is the principal part of justifying faith, by which we apply to ourselves the general promises of the gospel; and are by God accounted righteous for the sake of the merit of Christ; and by which we have a firm persuasion that hereafter we shall be heirs of eternal life. It is in respect to this *confidence* that faith is called saving or *justifying*. For God can justify no one unless he possesses confidence in Christ, and firmly believes that his sins are forgiven for his merit's sake. Hence, in order to salvation, a mere knowledge of Divine mysteries, or general assent is not sufficient; but confidence also is necessarily required. But we prove that faith is confidence. (1) From the appellations given it in the Scriptures. It is called *θάρσος*, *confidence*, John, 16: 33, *πληροφορία*, *a full and firm persuasion*, Heb. 10: 22. See also Heb. 3: 6. Eph. 3: 12. These terms cannot by any means be explained to signify only a mere knowledge of mysteries, or a general assent. For Satan himself believes as to a mere knowledge or assent, but then it profits him nothing, for by believing he trembles. (2) Because they who truly believe in Christ *know* that they have life eternal. See 1 John 5: 13. But no man can know from a mere naked *notion* and general *assent*, that he will have eternal life; yea, even despair may be united with

torum propter Christi sanguinem confidere, Mark, 5: 26. *Crede tantummodo* pro confide. Et hunc sensum praesertim habet in phrasi credere in Deum, in Christum, etc. (John 14: 1.) *Si creditis in Deum etiam in me credite*; pro confidite: Consolatur enim ibi Apostolos. (John 9: 36.) *Domine quis est, ut credam in eum?* pro, ut confidam in eo. *Fides salvica* nobis est conjuncta cum fiducia promissionis Evangelii, seu promissae misericordiae Dei remissione peccatorum propter Christi sanguinem: ut, cum dicimur *fide justificari*, fides fiduciam significat: et fide justificari, est fiducia meriti Christi a peccatis absolvi: quem sensum apostolus tradit, cum dicit: *Quem proposuit Deus placamentum per fidem in sanguine pro, ad declarandum justitiam suam per remissionem peccatorum precedentium*: ubi *fides in sanguine* suo, non potest nisi fiduciam sanguinis Christi significare. Illi vero quod fidem tantum de assensu, credere tantum pro assentiri intelligant, tum hoc ostendit, quod in Articulo verba Johannis cap. 3: 36. *ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ* reddunt: *Qui vero non assentitur filio*; pro, *qui non credit filio*: tum etc.—Vide *Anat. Arminianismi*, pp. 8, 9.

both knowledge and assent, as it is, for instance in the reprobate, and in all devils.”*

Tilenus, speaking of justifying faith, says, “This faith is called *ὑπόστασις*, by the apostle, because it is not an empty notion floating in the mind, but it realizes those things which as yet are in anticipation, and experimentally unknown to us, so that they appear, and exist. It is also called *ἐλεγχος*, because it demonstrates with so much certainty to the mind and to the hopes those things which as yet are unseen, of themselves, like as the light with certainty declares to the eyes of the body, those things which are visible. Heb. 11: 1. This faith is not only a notion united with assent, but also with confidence; by which the believer is *persuaded* that the promise pertains to himself.”†

* “*Hactenus materia fidei justificantis. Sequitur forma, quae constitit in tribus partibus, nempe, notitia, assensu, et fiducia. Notitia est prima fidei pars, quae de salutis nostrae ratione scriptura tradit, seu quae ad salutem scitu sunt necessaria, cognoscimus: Graecis ἐπίγνωσις. Assensus est altera fidei pars, quae ex scriptura novimus a Deo revelata, pro veris habemus: Graecis συγκατάθεσις. Fiducia est tertia et principalis pars fidei justificantis, quae generales Evangelii promissiones nobis applicamus, et nos, propter Christi meritum justos a Deo reputari, aeternaeque vitae haeredes fore, plene persuasum habemus: Graecis πληροφορία seu πεποιθήσις.*

Respectu *fiduciae* hujus fides appellatur *salvifica*, et *justificans*. Neminem enim justificat Deus, nisi qui *fiduciam* in Christo collocat, et propter ejus meritum sibi peccata remitti firmiter credit. Itaque ad salutem non sufficit vel notitia mysteriorum divinarum, vel *assensus* etiam generalis: sed necessario requiritur quoque *fiducia*. Esse autem fidem *fiduciam* probamus: (1) Ex appellationibus, quae in scriptura ipsi tribuuntur, appellatur enim *θάρος*, *confidentia*, John 16: 33. *πληροφορία*, *plena et firma persuasio*, Heb. 10: 22. *παρόρησις*, *libertas fiducialis*, Heb. 3: 6. *πεποιθήσις*, *firma persuasio*, Eph. 3: 12. *ὑπόστασις τῶν ἐλπιζομένων*, *subsistentia rerum speratarum, quae facit res speratas coram existere*. Nomina haec simplici notitiae mysteriorum vel assensus generali minime conveniunt. Credit enim *Satan*, quoad notitiam et assensum cui tamen *θάρος*, *πληροφορία* et *παρόρησις* nulla comperit quia credendo contremiscit. (2) Quia, qui vere credunt in Christum sciunt se habere vitam aeternam. 1 John 5: 13. *Haec scribo vobis, qui creditis in nomen Filii Dei, ut sciatis vos vitam aeternam habere*. Atqui ex nuda notitia et assensu generali nemo scit se vitam aeternam habere: imo cum notitia et assensu desperatio potest esse conjuncta et est in multis reprobis, omnibusque diabolis, conjuncta. Vide *Chris. Theolog. Wendelini*, Lib. I. cap. XXIV. p. 544—549.

† “Haec fides ab Apostolo vocatur *ὑπόστασις*, quia non est inane spectrum, in mente volitans, sed efficit, ut quae in expectatione sunt

Polanus, is the last that we shall quote. In his system of Theology, pp. 1883, 1884, he uses the following language. "The essential form of saving faith is a *full and sure persuasion*, an *absence of doubt and dispute*, concerning the truth, fidelity, power and mercy of God: and therefore concerning our reconciliation to God through Christ. See Luke 1: 37, etc. For which cause saving faith is not a naked notion, or knowledge of truth to be believed, or even a *firm assent*, but it is also a confidence of the mercy of God and of eternal salvation by and for the sake of Christ. This is clear from the following arguments.

1. Saving faith is a *πληροφορία*, that is, a full persuasion that what God has promised he is able to perform. Thus is the faith of Abraham described, Rom. 4: 11, and of Sarah, Heb. 11: 11. Now a persuasion of the power of God in performing his promises, is not a notion only, but a firm and undoubted confidence.

2. Saving faith is a strict acquiescence in the divine benevolence and favor. But it is objected 1. That the effect of saving faith is not its essential form; but confidence is the effect of faith; and therefore it is not the essential form of saving faith. The assumption is proved by the testimony of Paul in Eph. 3: 12, "In whom we have freedom and access with confidence, through faith in him." But to this I answer, that the assumption is to be distinguished, because it is ambiguous. For confidence in itself, as in the passage cited from Paul is a sure persuasion that prayer will be heard, if it be made in faith, and in the name of Christ. But confidence which is the essential form of saving faith, is a most certain persuasion of the truth, fidelity, power, and mercy of God, and reconciliation with him through Christ. The confidence of prayer is rightly said to be the effect of faith.

But it is again objected that confidence is the essential form of no intellectual virtue; but faith is an intellectual virtue; therefore confidence is not the essential form of faith. To this

posita, eoque essentiae videntur expertia, exstent quodammodo, ac subsistant. Item vocatur *ἔλγχιος*, quod tam certo demonstret menti ac spei, ea quae per se sunt inaspectabilia, quam certo lux manifestat oculis corporis, quae sunt adspectabilia *Heb. 11: 1*.—Fides haec non solum notitia est cum assensu, sed etiam cum fiducia conjuncta, qua credens persuasum habet promissionem etiam ad se pertinere. *Syn-tag. Tilen. p. 700, 1063.*

I answer that it is true, confidence is not the essential form of any intellectual virtue ; that is, of a virtue *purely intellectual*. *But I deny that faith is a virtue purely intellectual*. It is objected 3. etc. etc.”*

Here then we find *Gomar*, and *Polanus*, (to specify no other instances,) personally engaged in the very controversy that is now considered as separating Arminians and Calvinists. And we find *Gomar* also, (who is, according to the standard of *Turretin* a much more orthodox Calvinist than Calvin himself,) taking that side of the question which is now repudiated as Arminian. The very arguments that *Gomar* advances, Po-

* *Essentialis forma salvicae fidei, est πληροφορία ἀδιάκριτος, id est plena ac certa persuasio, dubitationis ac disceptationis expers, de veracitate, fidelitate, potentia, et misericordia Dei, ac proinde de reconciliatione nostri cum Deo per Christum*, Luc. 1: 37. Rom. 4: 21. Collos. 2: 2. Heb. 10: 22, and 11: 19, quae etiam dicitur *πεποίθησις, persuasio*, Rom. 8: 38. 2 Cor. 3: 4. Eph. 3: 12, et *ὑπόστασις*, Heb. 11: 1. Quocirca fides salvifica non est nuda notitia seu cognitio veritatis credendae, sed etiam firma assensio, sed etiam *πληροφορία* seu fiducia misericordiae Dei et salutis aeternae per et propter Christum. Id manifestum est ex sequentibus argumentis: 1. Quia fides salvifica est *πληροφορία*, id est, plena persuasio, Deum quod promisit, posse etiam efficere. Sic enim describitur fides Abrahami Roman. 4: 21, quod *plene persuasum habuerit, Deum quod promiserat posse etiam efficere*: et fides Sarae Heb. 11: 11, quod *fidelem esse duxerit cum promiserat*: autem persuasio de potentia Dei in praestandis promissis, non est tantum notitia, sed firma ac indubitata fiducia. 2. Quia fides salvifica est intima acquiescentia in divina benevolentia ac gratia. OBJICITUR 1. *Effectum fidei salvicae non est essentialis forma ejus. Fiducia est effectum fidei salvicae. Ergo non est essentialis forma fidei salvicae*. Assumptio probatur testimonio Pauli Ephes. 3: 12. *In quo habemus libertatem et auditum cum fiducia per fidem in ipsum*. RESP. Assumptio est distinguenda, quia est ambigua. Nam fiducia in ea, ut in dicto Pauli allegato, est persuasio curta de exauditione precum in nomine et fide Christi factarum: Sed fiducia quae est essentialis forma fidei salvicae est persuasio certissima, de veracitate, fidelitate, potentiae, ac misericordia Dei, et reconciliatione nostri cum Deo per Christum. Fiducia exauditionis recte dicitur esse effectum fidei. OBJICITUR 2. *Nul- lius virtutis intellectualis, forma essentialis est fiducia: Fides est virtus intellectualis: Ergo fidei forma essentialis non est fiducia*. RESP. Nul- lius virtutis, intellectualis, nimirum tantum intellectualis, tantum in intellectu sitae, forma essentialis est fiducia. At fidem esse virtutem tantum intellectualem, negatur: quia totius anima est perfectio. OBJICITUR 3. *Quicquid, etc.*” Vide *Syntag. Chris. Theol. Lib. IX. cap. 6*.

lanus disposes of; and the very arguments that Polanus urges, Gomar responds to: each considers himself in the right; and yet each esteems his brother as a sound orthodox Calvinist.

We might show by other quotations that Dr. Gomar has completely set aside those very objections which are now urged against the view which he takes of Rom. 4: 3, or Gen. 15: 6. But we forbear. The length of our discussion admonishes us to hasten to the concluding topic announced in the question at the head of this article.*

ARTICLE VIII.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ECCLESIASTES.

Translated from the German MS. of Dr. I. Nordheimer, Prof. in the University of the city of New York, by Wm. W. Turner; and revised by the Author.†

“Rectum iter quod sero cognovit lassusque errando aliis monstrat.”
Seneca.

THE book *Kohleth*, or as it is more frequently denominated *Ecclesiastes*, has already been made the subject of laborious inquiries by many learned men, stimulated thereto by the hope of being enabled to illumine the obscurity of its style and to extract the deep spiritual meaning which it seems to contain. As each writer regarded it from his own peculiar point of view, one taking it for one thing and one for another, it is easy to imagine that its fortunes must have been extremely various at various times. And thus in fact it was: for, in consequence of the apparently contradictory nature of its contents, it has been looked upon both as the gloomy imaginings of a melancholy misanthrope, and as the licentious suggestions of an Epicurean profligate; as the disputation of a wavering skeptic, and as a justification of God's providence in ruling the world.

* We regret the necessity of again postponing the remaining section of this article. It will be concluded in the next number of the Repository.—ED.

† Written in the year 1833, as an Introduction to a new translation of *Ecclesiastes* accompanied with critical and philological notes, which may appear in future Nos. of this Periodical.

Some again, with the view of freeing it from objections to which it has appeared to them obnoxious, have even gone so far as to convert it into a dialogue in which the preacher is made to speak as a learner, the bold tone of whose language is rebuked and softened down by the calm and soothing voice of his instructor. Another natural consequence of the variety of lights in which it has been viewed, is that it has met by turns with both advocates and opposers, and its tendency been regarded as beneficial or injurious accordingly.

It is not at present the writer's intention to enter into a particular enumeration and refutation of the numerous theories that have been broached and defended with greater or less ability by others, but simply to lay before the public, in addition to what has already been advanced, his own ideas with regard to this portion of Holy Writ. In order to combine the requisite degree of brevity with a satisfactory illustration of his positions, he will confine himself in his exhibition of the Philosophy of Ecclesiastes to a consideration of the two following questions :

First, *To what description of work does the book belong ?*

And Secondly, *What is its object, and what are its contents ?*

I. In reply to the first of these queries, when we consider the form, the course of ideas, and the contents of the work, we feel no hesitation in affirming it to be a *philosophic didactic poem*, whose design is to ascertain and exhibit the obligations of man to himself, to his fellow-man, and to God. This proposition having been advanced, we are now under the necessity of examining by the rules of art its author's style and train of thought ; these not unfrequently appear obscure and enigmatic, on account of the apparent want of connection occasioned by the rapidity of his transitions from one idea to another, now proving and lamenting, now exhorting and encouraging.

The writer of a philosophic didactic poem, whose principal object must be the development of moral truths, should seek to avoid the two extremes of wandering too far into the realms of poesy, or of restraining himself too strictly within philosophic bounds. His style should not be too constantly poetic, nor ever be allowed to become too animated, too lyric, or too pathetic ; on the contrary, he should observe a proper moderation in the employment of ornaments, images, and allegories ; and frequently vary the tone of his discourse. Again, he should not deliver his philosophic truths in scholastic phraseology encumbered with proofs and explanations, or observe a too pre-

cise order of arrangement ; but he should continually refer to life and daily experience, never becoming cold and formal, but moving and convincing by his warmth and earnestness.* If we now test by these precepts the work before us, we shall find that it conforms to them in every essential particular ; and thus not only will its obscurities of diction be explained, but its enigmatic train of thought will likewise no longer present such a disconnected appearance.

Its style must not be too constantly poetical or possess too much animation.

How sublime and powerful, how penetrating and convincing, yet how brief and simple are the descriptions and even the complaints of the composition before us in comparison with those of any other sacred poems of the East ! Let us for the sake of illustration compare a passage containing the development of a single idea with a corresponding one from that precious relic of oriental antiquity, the magnificent production of Job. In the following few words the preacher expresses with forcible brevity that which Job occupies a chapter in portraying with a profusion of illustration and poetic ornament.

“ I returned, and beheld all the oppressions that are committed under the sun. I saw the tears of the oppressed, and they had no comforter ; bowed were they by the violent hand of their oppressors, and they had no comforter.

Then praised I the dead because they are already dead, rather than the living because they are yet alive.”—*Eccl.* c. 4. v. 1, 2.

And again,

“ All this have I observed during my vain existence : righteous persons perishing in their righteousness, and wicked ones going on long in their wickedness.”—*Eccl.* c. 7. v. 15.

Here the poet has depicted the sufferings of the innocent and the triumphs of the wicked with a few powerful strokes. In the hands of Job the former part of the subject is wrought into the following highly finished picture :

“ Why, since destinies are not hidden from the Almighty,
Do not his friends behold his days of punishment ?
The wicked remove boundaries ;
They carry off flocks, and feed them for their own :
They drive away the ass of the fatherless ;
The widow's ox they take for a pledge :
They thrust the needy from the path ;

* See Eschenberg's *Theorie der schönen Wissenschaften*.

The poor of the earth are compelled to hide together.
 Behold, like wild asses, they flee into the wilderness ;
 By their labor they seek in the desert food for themselves,
 bread for their children :
 They cut provender for themselves in the field ;
 And they glean the vineyard of the wicked :
 Naked, they pass the night without clothing ;
 And have no covering from the cold :
 They are wet with rain from the mountains,
 And lie without shelter in the rocks."

Job c. 24. v. 1—8.

The prosperity of the wicked he thus describes :

Why do the wicked flourish ?
 Why grow they old, and even increase in strength ?
 Their seed is established around about them,
 And their offspring before their eyes :
 Their houses are free from alarm ;
 And the rod of God is not laid upon them :
 Their bull impregnates, and does not fail ;
 Their cow brings forth, and does not miscarry :
 They send out their little ones like sheep ;
 And their children dance ;
 They shout to the timbrel and harp,
 And rejoice at the sound of the flute."

Job c. 21. v. 7—12.

What an essential difference here presents itself in the manner of the two writers. One in the sententious style of a philosopher expresses the conviction as the result of his experience, that innocence suffers, while vice triumphs. The other in a strain of sad inspiration pursues the subject through all its ramifications, and presents a highly wrought picture to the reader's mind. The same difference is perceptible between the two poets in their modes of giving utterance to the firm persuasion, that with the innocent sufferer all will at length be well, while punishment cannot fail in the end to overtake the prosperous sinner. The Preacher says :

"Although the sinner commit wickedness a hundred times, and carry it on long ; still I know that it shall be well with those who fear God, because they fear him.

But it shall not be well with the wicked, neither shall he prolong his days, which are like a shadow ; because he does not fear God."

Ecc. c. 8. v. 12, 13.

His confidence in the ultimate triumph of innocence is thus expressed by Job :

"I know that my Redeemer lives ;
• And that at last he will stand upon the earth. .
And though my skin may then have been destroyed,
Still in my flesh I shall behold God :
Whom I choose for myself, and my eyes look for without moving ;
For whom my heart pines in my bosom."
Job c. 19. v. 25—27.

And in the twenty-fourth chapter, after concluding his enumeration of the crimes of the wicked, he portrays their end in these terms :

"He is light upon the surface of the waters, his portion is cursed upon earth :
His way leads not to pleasant places.
As drought and heat consume snow-water,
So shall hell the sinner :
Friendship shall forget him—sweet food for worms !
He shall be remembered no more ; wickedness shall be broken down like a tree."
Job c. 24. v. 18—20.

From these examples it will be seen, that while Job endeavors to adorn his ideas with all the embellishments and amplifications of poetry, the philosophic author of *Ecclesiastes* is content with exhibiting general truths.

If we examine into the ground of the difference in both the style and general plan of the two writers, we shall find that it arises from the opposite circumstances in which their productions were compared. Job complains of his personal grievances ; his bodily pains furnish the theme of his discourse, which consequently turns almost entirely upon himself : while the preacher directs his searching gaze on mankind collectively, and his language partakes of the same general character with his speculations. Thus Job, weighed down by the loss of his earthly possessions, racked with bodily pain, and completely overpowered by the mournful reflections which for many sleepless days and nights had been pent up within his bosom, at length breaks from his fearful silence into terrible complaints, curses the day of his birth and the night of his conception, curses himself and his destiny, wishes in the most solemn man-

ner that he had never seen the light, describes in his anguish as enviable the lot of an infant prematurely born, and paints in glowing terms the state of undisturbed repose he should have enjoyed, had such been the fate allotted to himself. On the contrary, it is not his individual misfortunes that call forth the preacher's complaining voice ; but the sight of the distresses of others, the conviction how often the innocent is made to bend under the yoke of the oppressor, extort his lamentations, and force him to cry out, " Happier are the dead in being already dead, than the living in being still alive." His *dicta* consequently are of universal application.

A still greater difference between the two works will appear on subjecting them to a closer inspection, a difference which does not lie in the mere choice of expressions or in a greater or less fulness of detail, but which pervades the entire plan and conduct of each. The preacher, sound in body and unrestricted in his views, casts his intelligent glance over the whole world and the occurrences that take place within it, remains constant to his purpose of combating the doubts and removing the objections which either force themselves upon his attention or are proposed by himself in order to obtain the nearest possible approximations to the truth, and of then laying down the results of his inquiries in the form of universal maxims for the conduct of life. With Job the case is entirely different : he, borne to the earth by his own sufferings both mental and physical, breaks out into complaints which drown the consoling voice of reason, that vainly strives from time to time to make itself heard ; driven to desperation by the horrid fate that has so suddenly overtaken him, not only does his own reason prove insufficient to bring him to a state of calmness and resignation, but even the excellent arguments and grounds of consolation presented by his friends fail in making the slightest impression on his agonized mind. Nought has the power of moderating his affliction, until at length the majesty of God himself from the clouds, to solve the *dignus vindice nodus*, and silence him with the voice of Omnipotence. With a crushed and penitent heart he regrets the rash expressions he had uttered, and feels his troubles soothed.

If we now compare Ecclesiastes with the golden Proverbs of Solomon, which likewise consist of moral aphorisms, מִכְּשָׁרִים, ἀποφθίγματα, γνώμαι ; or with the maxims of profane authors, such as Pythagoras, Lucretius, and Cato ; we shall find some resemblance in the brief periods and condensed phraseology in

which they all have presented the results of their investigations, as also in the topics of advice, warning, and consolation suggested by their experience : it being a common practice of the ancients, before the line of demarcation between prose and poetry had been distinctly drawn, to communicate the knowledge they possessed in short harmonious sentences. Yet, notwithstanding this, they are not without striking points of dissimilarity. The moralists, we have mentioned, are accustomed to utter their councils and warnings in language highly figurative and poetical, and accompanied by a certain copiousness of illustration, while the Preacher lays down his rules with remarkable simplicity and conciseness. In the Proverbs of Solomon, wisdom is thus described as the greatest good, and its worth and power exhibited in various lights.

“ I, Wisdom, dwell with prudence,
 And make myself acquainted with reflection :
 Counsel is mine, and deliberation ;
 I am understanding, and power is mine.
 By me kings reign,
 And princes decree justly :
 By me princes rule,
 And nobles, and all judges of the earth.
 I love those who love me,
 And those who diligently seek me shall find me.
 Riches and honor accompany me,
 Dazzling wealth and virtue.
 My fruit is better than gold, even than fine gold,
 And my profit than choice silver.
 I walk in the way of virtue,
 In the midst of the paths of justice.
 I give to my friends substance,
 And fill their treasures,” etc.

Prov. c. 8. v. 12, 14—21.

The language held by the Preacher is to the same effect ; he, however, enters into no minuteness of detail, but sets forth its advantages in the following general terms :

“ Wisdom is good with an inheritance, and still better to those who know wherein happiness consists.

For wisdom protects where wealth protects ; but the advantage of acquiring wisdom is, that she gives life to her possessors.”

Eccl. c. 7. v. 11, 12.

Another and a still more essential difference is observable

between the book of Ecclesiastes and the maxims of Solomon, Pythagoras, and Cato. These latter do indeed deliver their precepts in a style generally forcible and concise; but, at the same time, they are dogmatic, and on no occasion disclose the mode by which they have arrived at a knowledge of the truths they undertake to promulgate. The preacher, on the contrary, seems ever solicitous to lead his readers with him along the path of experience, and thus cause them to arrive at the truth as it were simultaneously with himself. In order to accomplish this object he very appropriately adopts the character of a skeptical inquirer, and then in the presence of his readers commences his investigations: In the course of these he himself puts queries and raises objections, in order, by answering and refuting them, to exhibit his doctrines with greater perspicuity and force. In the Proverbs of Solomon the beauty and advantages of wisdom are dwelt upon through several chapters, and its attainment recommended as the highest object of human ambition, but without any intimation of the manner in which the writer obtained his conviction of its extreme importance. The preacher, on the contrary, at once brings forward an example drawn from his own observation, and thence deduces the general principle which it involves. He says,

"This wisdom also have I seen under the sun, and found it important.

"There was a small city and but few men in it; and there came against it a great king, who surrounded it, and raised against it great entrenchments.

"Now there was found in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom delivered the city; yet no one noticed that poor man.

"Then said I, wisdom is better than strength," etc.

Eccl. c. 9. v. 13—16.

On comparing this with one of Cato's precepts, it will be perceived that the latter observes the plan adopted by Solomon, viz. of bestowing his advice as derived from experience, but without communicating more than the result. The words of Cato are,

"Corporis exigui vires contemnere noli:
Consilio pollet cui vim natura negavit."

We now return to the statement made in the outset, that the work under consideration is a philosophic didactic poem, composed while the investigations on which it is founded were

going on, and executed in such a manner that the opinions of its author are conveyed in the replies to the questions advanced by himself; and this, we think, we have satisfactorily shown to be the case. Hence there will appear nothing surprising in the fact, that the poet frequently passes quickly from one object to another, and, after dwelling on it awhile, returns to take up again the thread of his investigation at the point where he had quitted it; that at one time we see him proving and instructing, at another complaining and consoling; and that in so doing his style becomes as varied as his topics: for this very diversity is in strict compliance with the rules laid down for the species of composition under which we have ventured to class his production. And this naturally conducts us to the result which so many have endeavored to reach in vain, viz. that although the poet frequently appears to turn aside from the paths in which he had set out, there is constantly observable an internal bond of connection, a gentle gradation from one division of his subject to another, and even from one scene to another; at the end of which he seeks to condense in one principal assertion the sum of all his experience. How this interconnection of its different parts, as well as the gradual progression of the inquiry through each successive stage, is discoverable in the work before us, will be discussed at length in the sequel.

II. We now come to a consideration of the second question, "What is the object of the book, and what are its contents?" The only means of obtaining a satisfactory reply, is that of having recourse to an examination of the book itself; and hence the solution of the former part of the query depends entirely on that of the latter. In consequence of this necessity of applying to the body of the work for information as to its design, the obscurity of its language, its frequently varying style, and the apparently conflicting nature of the opinions it maintains, have had the effect of producing views on the subject nearly as numerous as the persons who have engaged in the investigation. But of all the theories which have yet been broached on this head, there is surely none more shallow or more absurd than that which regards the book of Ecclesiastes as the production of a wavering skeptic, or which is worse, of a patron of infidelity; since the very reverse of this supposition can be most decidedly proved. If while inspecting a book for the purpose of discovering its tendency we meet with doubts proposed and

positions momentarily taken up for the sake of illustration, we are by no means warranted in assuming them to be the author's *ultima* ; since such are often made to constitute the commencement of an investigation, being employed by the author as the means by which to arrive at his final results, in accordance with the Cartesian theory that all philosophic truths are the results of inquiries begun by doubting. The entire history of *skepticism*, properly so called, from Pyrrho to Hume downwards fully confirms the truth of Kant's description of it, viz.

“It is a miserably preconceived mistrust, not preceded by an investigation of the powers of pure reason, and arising solely from the failure of its positive assertions.”

In like manner as this skepticism is prejudicial to speculative reason, by undermining all philosophic knowledge, and denying to it any certainty whatever, so is it also dangerous to practical reason, or practical life, when allowed to extend to this latter. For when the mind, intent on investigating all the relations of life, goes onward in its activity without first examining into and ascertaining its own powers, in order thereby to regulate its demands and decisions, it is liable to fall into a skepticism whose effects on practical life are exceedingly hurtful. Thus, the man who has resolved to subject life to a rigid scrutiny ; to ascertain with precision the obligations of man to himself, to his fellow-man, and to God ; and to institute a minute inquiry into his future fate, with the view of adjusting his life and actions accordingly, may easily, in forming his conclusions, strike into a wrong path, which, instead of conducting him to the haven of contentment, may lead to his eternal destruction ; unless he first resolves to ascertain the extent of the powers of his mind that he may know what as man he can expect to attain, and then sets bounds to his endeavors by selecting some definite object of pursuit. For by entering thus unprepared in his examination of nature and life, whenever he met with the reverse of that which he had hoped to find true, or whenever he came to a knowledge of the many unaccountable contradictions and apparently inexplicable enigmas which exist in nature, in the fate of man, and in the relations of man to his Creator, he would either be induced to regard the world as a vale of misery, and consequently drag out his useless life in hopeless discontent ; or, disheartened by the constantly recurring obstacles to his progress presented by the revolving course of events, he would deny the existence of every thing

exalted in nature, and thus degrade himself to a level with the brutes.

To set bounds to this sinful endeavor, and to warn mankind of the danger attendant upon it, appears to have been the principal aim of the author of this book. In order to execute his arduous undertaking in the most effectual manner possible, he adopted, and with great propriety, the Socratic or skeptical method of induction. The main feature of this method consists in a suspension of the final decision, until the truth has been rendered perfectly evident, and the writer has it in his power to make assertions that shall be incontrovertible; hence it is the most perfect mode of attaining absolute certainty that can be conceived. In this manner it is that the author of *Ecclesiastes* institutes his examination into the powers of the human mind, which he carries to such fearful lengths that reason itself threatens to totter from its throne. All this is done in order to test its strength, and to bound its sphere of action accordingly, to the end that it may not run in danger, from the impossibility of comprehending the highest phenomena in nature, of introducing into practical life the errors which are the result of such imperfect conceptions. And at last he arrives at the conclusion, that as reason can know itself in the form of human reason alone, it is utterly unable to penetrate the ultimate designs of the Deity, or even all the secrets of his works in nature, viz. that it can never succeed in discovering all the hidden powers which are constantly at work in the world; and that consequently man has no right to complain of the apparent contradictions he meets with, much less to suffer himself to be led by them into error.

In the course of this skeptical inquiry, however, the author does not always confine himself strictly to his principal subject, but frequently enters, after the usual manner of the ancient philosophers, into a discussion of individual cases of life, to render more obvious and forcible the rules for its conduct which his experience enables him to lay down. This mode of procedure enables him to attain his object with much greater certainty than it would have been possible for him to do by following the plan of the proverbs of Solomon or of the verses of Pythagoras. For to these latter a skeptic might urge all the objections which the Preacher proposes to himself; while they are totally unable to reply to and confute such objections, and accordingly so not to effectually advocate the cause of truth.

The author of Ecclesiastes selected the method he employs to the end that he might show at once to his readers the manner in which he arrived at a knowledge of the truths he engages in propagating, what internal struggles their acquisition cost him, and how he succeeded in extricating himself from the perilous labyrinth of doubt and ignorance. In so doing he exhausts every objection that can be brought forward, and effectually bars all ingress to the path of error by his ingenious and conclusive reasoning.

Having premised thus much in general, we will now follow the course of the author guided by these views, with the hope of disclosing that hidden connection which has so long eluded every search. Throughout the whole performance we plainly discern the author's design, which is to inscribe the *μηδὲν ἄγαν* on every human effort, mental as well as physical. The reason for this lies in his conviction that the majority of those who feel themselves unhappy owe their wretchedness to ill directed and ill regulated exertion ; since, as too violent bodily labor accelerates physical death, so does overstrained application of the mind quicken the decay of the mental powers. This truth has been well expressed by the elegant Herder. "There is a wilful destruction of the powers of human intellect, which might be termed a most refined species of suicide. And it is so much the more to be deplored, as it is met with only in minds of the most choice description, whose delicate structure it either at once or by insensible degrees reduces to ruins. Persons of the most exquisite sensibility have some elevated standard of excellence to which they aspire, some idea after which they grasp with inexpressible longing, some *beau idéal* which with fondness they strive to attain. Should this idea be torn from them, should this beautiful image be destroyed before their eyes, the heart-leaf of the plant will be rent in fragments, and nought remain but its withered stalk. Probably there are many more such to be found within the circle of our acquaintances than we are accustomed to suppose ; for they seek for the most part to conceal within the sad recesses of their hearts, even from their dearest friends, the poison that consigns them to a lingering death."*

How true, alas, is this mournful picture ! How many are there who sacrifice in the search after imaginary felicity the

* Zerstreute Blätter, p. 80.

solid happiness they already enjoy ! Touched by this sad experience, the author of Ecclesiastes resolved on devoting his energies to the composition of a work which should point out to his fellow-men in what true happiness consists. In the very outset he warns his readers against forming too exalted an idea of life ; since here no permanent good, no real *יִתְרוֹן*, is to be obtained. Again, as the world moves in a perpetual circuit, so does the fate of man at all times retain the stamp of uniformity ; for, says he, “one generation passes away and another arises, but the world remains ever the same.” An idea thus expressed by Lucretius in his magnificent poem *De Rerum Natura* :

“Nec remorantur ibi : sic rerum summa novatur
Semper, et inter se mortales mutuo vivunt.
Augescunt aliae gentes, aliae minuuntur.”

Lib. II. v. 74—76.

As this revolving state of things is the fixed law of the world, man will in vain strive to free himself from it. . He will therefore act more wisely not to expend his strength in ineffectual endeavors to attain degrees of knowledge and happiness which are placed forever beyond his reach. To the same effect is the advice of Horace :

“Insani sapiens nomen ferat, æquus iniqui,
Ultra quam satis erat virtutem petat ipsam.”

The uncontrollable and restless eagerness which mankind too frequently evince to arrive at a goal which constantly flies their pursuit, can be productive of nought but the pain resulting from frequent disappointment ; which truth our author confirms in the declaration (v. 18), “in much wisdom there is much sorrow.” Thus too Lucretius in his forcible manner exclaims,

“Certare ingenio ; contendere nobilitate ;
Noctes atque dies niti præstante labore
Ad summas emergere opes, rerumque potiri.
O miseras hominum mentes, O pectora coeca !”

Lib. XII. v. 11—14.

How eloquently is this prolific source of human woes described by Pythagoras in his Golden Verses !

Γνώση δ' ἥ θάμιν ἐστὶ φύσιν παρὶ πάντος ὁμολήν,
ὥστε σε μήτε ἀέλπτ' ἐλπίζειν μήτε τι λήθειν.

γνώση δ' ἀνθρώπους ἀνθαίρετα πῆματ' ἔχοντας·
 τλήμονες, οἱ τ' ἀγαθῶν πύλας ὄντων οὐκ ἐσορῶσιν
 οὔτε κλύουσι· λύσιν δὲ κακῶν παῦροι συνίσασιν.
 τοίη μοῖρα βροτῶν βλάπτει φρένας· ὥς δὲ κολλήθροισι
 ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλα φέρονται ἀπείρονα πῆματ' ἔχοντας.
 λυγρὴ γὰρ συνοπαδὸς Ἔρις βλάπτουσα λήληθε
 σύμφυτος, ἣν οὐ δεῖ προσάγειν, εἶχοντα δὲ φεύγειν.
 Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἣ πολλῶν καὶ κακῶν λύσειας ἅπαντας,
 ἣ πᾶσιν δείξαις, οἷω τῷ δαίμονι χρῶνται.

"Know thou that, as it becomes her, nature in all things is equal ;
 So shalt thou not dare to hope for the good that to hope is denied thee.
 Know that the ills which oppress human kind are of their own seeking;
 Wretched they live ; for they see not, they hear not the joys that are
 near them,

And few understand to escape from the snares with which life is
 surrounded.

So sad a fate wounds deeply the soul. Like bowls on the greensward,
 Hither and thither they're borne, hiding griefs without end in their
 bosoms.

Eris that evil companion, secretly plots their destruction ;
 Her they should flee, nor ever their safety trust to her guidance.
 Jupiter, Father ! would'st thou all men from these evils deliver,
 Oh, grant to each mind the power of employing its energies rightly."

There is, however, this grand distinction between these writers and our author, that the latter describes their endless aspirations after unattainable felicity as unwise and unholy, not from the mere conclusions of argumentative reasoning, but from that profound conviction which is produced by experience alone. He performs the part of mankind in his own person, steps himself upon the stage of life as one entirely occupied with these desires, and in awfully vivid colors depicts the fate which awaits their indulgence : this is done with the design of working in the most powerful manner, viz., by the force of example, upon the sympathies of his readers, and of thereby saving them from the consequences of their unrestrained desires. How admirably does such language become a Solomon, him who had fully proved every enjoyment both mental and physical that man can taste ; and how powerfully should it affect us when, sitting on his lofty throne, he declares from his own experience, and in tones of the deepest self-abasement, that all is transitory and vain ! No man on earth could have made such a declaration with equal power and effect.

Having taken (chapter i.) this part upon himself, and hav-

ing stated in the twelve introductory verses the main design of the ensuing chapters, which is, to prove that all the solicitude which mankind give themselves for the acquisition of real earthly good must ever remain unrequited, he proceeds to demonstrate the truth of his positions from the events of his own biography. He commences his inquiries by a strict self-examination; and before he has cast a glance on the world without, he comes to the conclusion (chapter ii.) that physical enjoyment is unworthy the pursuit of a rational being. This he was perfectly warranted in affirming; for all the appliances of luxury stood at his command, he tested them all, and found them all equally worthless. He does not, however, stop at this stage of his researches; for he had resolved on ascertaining all for himself, on exploring every path of human activity, to the end that his want of success in the search after real earthly good might not be attributed to the imperfect nature of his investigation. Accordingly he next inquires into the value of mental attainments (v. 12), and also into the nature of the mind itself: but here likewise he meets with nothing satisfactory; for, although wisdom is certainly preferable to folly, they are still both subject to a common lot. Proceeding in this manner with his self-examination, he encounters nought but bitter disappointment, and is already induced (v. 17) to express himself disgusted with life.

Such are the results of his inquiries as directed towards himself, from which he now passes (chap. iii.) to the external world; and thus he comes to a consideration of time and of mankind as existing in time. He investigates all that relates to this subject, and finds that God has indeed ordered every thing beautifully in time, and that every thing is dependent upon God; but he sees that men act unjustly towards one another, and mutually embitter each other's lives. He perceives that the just are often wrongfully dealt with by human tribunals (v. 16), while the unjust are permitted to escape with impunity: and thus the pious does not meet with his just reward in this life, nor the wicked with his proper punishment. From this he draws the conclusion (v. 17), that God will judge them both, and will then assign to the just his true reward, and to the unjust his true punishment. In this manner the Preacher shows that the grand argument for a belief in a system of rewards and punishments after death, lies in the unjust treatment which men experience at the hands of one another.

Having thus arrived at the idea of God, the poet next endeavors (v. 18) to ascertain the nature of the relation existing between man and the Deity, with the view of discovering in what the superiority of man over all other creatures really consists. He examines life in all its several aspects, but cannot perceive that man enjoys any essential superiority in either his birth, his life, or his death, in all of which the fate of every created being is in all important respects the same. He, therefore, justly concludes (v. 21) that this is to be sought for in the future after death, when the spirit of man ascends to dwell with God, while that of the brute sinks into annihilation. In this consists the preacher's second argument for the existence of a future state; so that he has already twice surmounted those formidable barriers which oppose the progress of the adventurous inquirer, and threaten to hurl him from their summits into the dark abyss of infidelity. Having thus rescued his belief in the justice of God from the mazy labyrinth of speculation, he is enabled to guide into the right path all those who venture in spite of his warnings to explore by the glimmering light of human reason the dark and hidden things of God and nature, and are thus drawn into imminent danger of perishing in its tortuous windings.

Again (ch. iv.) the poet enters upon the world's wide stage, to view the life of man as exhibited in society. And here a sad spectacle presents itself before his eyes; he beholds man disconsolately weeping over the wrongs inflicted by the hand of his brother man; touched with emotions of pity and sorrow he exclaims (v. 2), "Happier are the dead because they are already dead, than the living because they are yet alive." He proceeds still further, and finds that all the labor and turmoil of men owe their origin to a mutual envy; and that this frequently assumes the hateful form of avarice, causing them to hoard up treasures merely to the end that they may become richer than their neighbors, while they themselves are totally unable to enjoy aught of the fruits of their parsimony. This sad experience suggests to him some reflections (v. 9), which he delivers in the shape of maxims, until he comes to consider the conduct to be observed in drawing near to God, with respect to which he gives (v. 17) the following advice. "Be on thy guard when thou enterest the house of God, and approachest to hear, against offering the sacrifice of fools, who do not consider the evil they do."

Being thus brought to an immediate consideration of the Deity, the poet goes on to describe further the conduct which man should pursue towards his Creator ; his discourse turning especially on sins of the tongue, to which men are so prone that they often fall into them from sheer inadvertence. He warns (chap. v.) against wordiness in prayer, since one who speaks much is extremely liable to let fall some foolish thing. In the Proverbs (10: 19) Solomon censures the commission of the same fault in ordinary conversation :

“In many words there is not wanting sin ;
But he who restrains his lips is wise.”

This is also reprehended by Cato in the following words :

“Rumores fuge, ne incipias novus auctor haberi :
Nam nulli tacuisse noret, noret esse locutum.”

Our author next exhorts to the performance of vows (v. 3), as a duty to which a man is bound by his words, and which if left unfulfilled will only add to the sinner's guilt. Thus too the Grecian poet :

“Μὴτ' ἐπιρκήσης, μὴτ' ἀγνώῃς, μὴτι ἐκοντὶ
Ψεύδοικον στογίῃ θύος ἄβροτος ὅς τις ὁμόσῃ.”

Having laid down his precepts on the subject of our duty to God with regard to language, he returns to a consideration of the manifold evils which follow in the train of insatiable avarice, and these he places before the view of the covetous man (v. 9, 17) with the intention of checking if possible the greedy thirst of gain. He shows him, reflected in the clear glass of truth, the quiet happy life of the contented man as contrasted with his own, and which Cato with his usual terseness thus recommends :

“Commoda naturæ nullo tibi tempore deerunt
Si contentus eo fueris quod postulat usus.”

This suggests to him the precarious tenure on which all earthly possessions are held ; and shows him that should he by any accident be deprived of them without allowing himself to enjoy them, the reflection would render him far more unhappy than he would have been had riches never fallen to his lot. He concludes (v. 17) with the rational advice, to enjoy with moderation the gifts of Providence, instead of striving incessantly after more. So Cato :

**"Utere quesitis opibus, fuge nomen avari :
Quid tibi divitiæ prosunt, si pauper abundas !"**

The vision of avarice conjured up before the poet's mental eye has taken too powerful a hold on his imagination to be at once dispelled ; the ghastly form still floats before him. As he proceeds, (chap. vi.) in describing the horrors that occupy his soul, he exclaims : (v. 3) " If a man have a hundred children, and live many years, and lead a prosperous life, but do not enjoy his good things, or receive funeral rites, I declare, that a premature birth is happier than he." And he ends (v. 12) with setting forth the folly of the miser, in allowing himself no enjoyment in this life, which he permits to pass from him like a shadow, without knowing what the future is to bring forth. And here (chap. vii.) the poet pauses awhile to lay down a number of additional maxims, the fruit of his preceding investigations. From the censure of folly he naturally passes to the praise of wisdom, by which he is led back (v. 13) to his main argument, that man cannot penetrate the designs of God. From this he deduces (v. 16) the general principle of a medium in all things, which he seeks to impress on the minds of his fellow-men as their safest guide through the intricate paths of life ; for he says (v. 23), " All this have I tried by wisdom : I said, I shall become wise ; but it remained far from me." And again (v. 25), I applied with heart and soul to the acquisition of knowledge and wisdom ; but I found at last that the fruits of this anxious desire to investigate every thing were bitterer than death ; and that he alone who trusts steadfastly in God, and to whom God is gracious, can escape with safety from the labyrinth in which such an undertaking must involve him. This new result of his researches serves to give additional strength to his previous warnings against the restless search after forbidden knowledge ; for in consequence of the barriers that in every direction oppose the progress of human inquiry, the man who is not content with that portion of knowledge which it is permitted him to obtain, must either be condemned to perpetual grief for the frustration of his desires ; or else, by breaking through the bounds prescribed to humanity, he will become an outcast from his species, and in consequence be plunged into the very lowest depths of despair. Yet hear the words of Lucretius :

**" Ut genus humanum frustra plerumque probavit
Volvere curarum tristes in pectora fluctus."**

The design thus exhibited by the sacred writer, to warn mankind against every species of ill-regulated desire by pointing out its evil consequences, appears also to lie as the principal idea at the bottom of the masterpiece of Göthe, we mean his *Faust*. There exists, however, a marked difference between the two works even in this respect: Our author directly warns against the error, and in the most earnest and forcible language predicts its dire results; while Göthe shadows it forth dramatically in the fate of a single individual, and shows by this means that the possessor of the rarest talents by breaking through the laws of his nature will come to be at variance with the world around him, and thus convert it into a hell as regards himself even while he lives.

The Preacher, having completed his inquiries into the obligations of man to himself, now enters (chap. viii.) upon those which he is under to his fellow-men; and first he takes into consideration the king, as the highest individual in human society, and prescribes rules for the conduct to be observed towards him. He begins by recommending to subjects in general, as their first and highest duty, an unshaken fidelity to their sovereign (v. 3), and then speaks of the punishments which await evil rulers. In this chapter the poet leaves the skeptical mode of arguing with which he set out, and merely proposes questions to himself in order to show the manner in which he arrives at his doctrines; having done this, he proceeds to lay them down in the manner of a teacher. As already observed, he first recommends the observance of steadfast obedience to the king, even should his reign be tyrannical: the reason for which is, that tyranny cannot be of long duration, and punishment must overtake it in the end. He conducts his readers (v. 10) in imagination to the tyrants' tombs, and exhibits them as consigned to an eternal oblivion, which in the East is considered to be the most severe of all inflictions; and then (v. 12) breaks out into the joyous exclamation, "Though the sinner do evil an hundred times, and carry it on long, sure am I that in the end it will be well with those who fear God." Yet to this pleasing conviction is immediately opposed (v. 14) the sad experience which seems to contradict it, that it as frequently goes well with the wicked, and ill with the good. This threatens to draw him once more into the vortex of materialism; but, says the poet (v. 16), as I endeavored with the greatest anxiety to find out the reason of all this, I became convinced

that it is not in the power of man thoroughly to explore the works of God. And thus this reflection again occurs to him as an angel of deliverance, leading him in safety from the dark labyrinth into which he had wandered.

A similar instance in one of the Psalms, where the writer by reflecting on the prosperity of the wicked would have been in danger of wavering in his belief, had it not been for his firm reliance on Providence, is too excellent and too appropriate to be omitted.

PSALM LXXIII.

Surely God is good to Israel,
To those that are pure of heart.
But as for me, I had nearly fallen from my feet ;
Within a little my steps had slipped :
When I envied the foolish,
And regarded the prosperity of the wicked.
For death has no bands for them,
And their health remains firm ;
They are free from human troubles,
And are not afflicted like other men :
Pride stiffens their necks,
Violence covers them like a garment ;
Their eyes stand out with fatness,
They surpass the desires of their hearts ;
They speak in mockery of wrong and oppression,
Loftily they speak ;
They assail the heavens with their mouths,
And their tongues go through the earth.
So that their people reach thus far,
And water in abundance is poured out to them.
But they say, How shall God know ?
Is it regarded by the Most High ?
Behold, these are the wicked,
And in continual security they amass wealth.
Have I then purified my heart in vain,
And washed my hands in innocence ?
In vain been afflicted all the day,
And chastened in the morning ?
If I said, I will speak thus,
I should deal falsely with the generation of thy children.
I strove to understand this,
But to me it seemed hard ;
Until I entered into the sanctuary of God,
And discovered what was their end.

On what slippery places hast thou set them !
 Thou hast cast them down to ruin.
 How have they become desolate in a moment !
 They are swept away with sudden destruction.
 Like a dream when one awakes,
 Thou Lord shall publicly despise their image.
 When my heart is vexed,
 And my reins are pierced ;
 Then am I stupid and ignorant,
 And like a beast in thy sight :
 Yet am I ever with thee ;
 Thou holdest me by my right hand.
 If thou lead me in thy counsel,
 And conduct me to glory ;
 Whom else have I in heaven,
 And what besides thee can I desire on earth ?
 Though my heart and my flesh fail,
 The stay of my heart and my portion is God forever.
 For behold they who are far from thee shall perish :
 Thou destroyest all those who go astray from thee.
 But as for me, the presence of God is my delight ;
 In the Lord Jehovah I confide, and recount all thy works.

Being thus led anew to the conviction that it is impossible for man to estimate the actions of God, the poet exerts all his power of reason to vindicate the conduct of the Most High. He asserts that all is under the control of God, that each individual thing is to be regarded as a portion of the whole to which it belongs ; and that nothing exists for itself alone, or can rise independently above the rest of creation. Every thing, therefore, to be judged of correctly, must be viewed in all the relations which it bears to other existences ; but as this is frequently altogether beyond the power of man, he should ever guard against suffering himself to be misled by those isolated facts which are above his comprehension, bearing in mind the warning of Homer :

Μοῖραν δ' οὐτινά φημι πεφυγμένον ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν.

Il. vi.

This is the language which every one should address to himself, to prevent his being led into error and consequent unhappiness by the contradictions and obscurities to be met with in nature. But, says the poet (v. 3), the greatest evil under the sun is, that one and the same fate happens to all : this is an evil which leads men to the commission of crime ; for it causes

them, as our author expresses it, to entertain the idea that the condition of a living dog is preferable to that of a dead lion, since, with death, every thing is at an end. From this doctrine it follows that physical enjoyment is to be pursued as the greatest good ; for, says the deluded one, if even during life there is no distinction made between the good and the bad, how much less is it to be expected after death ! The poet expresses his pity for mankind in this respect (v. 12), and leaves the reader to his own reflections.

By this mode of viewing it, the apparent inconsistencies of the chapter under consideration are removed, and the preacher appears in the light of a noble moralist free from all reproach. In this chapter also he takes occasion to show that to his reason he owes his deliverance from the labyrinth into which his restless endeavors to penetrate all the secrets of nature had plunged him. For it is reason alone in its highest state of development that can form an estimate of its own powers, and in consequence he is content with comprehending only so much as it is possible for it to know, without attempting what is entirely beyond its reach, and in this manner working its own destruction. The poet illustrates the value of this practical wisdom by an example (v. 14), from which he draws the conclusion that knowledge is to be prized above physical force. In chap. x. he lays down those maxims which this conviction of the preëxcellence of wisdom suggests. He had already (c. 8. v. 2.) recommended obedience to the powers that be : he now describes the blessing which a good ruler and the curse which an evil one may prove to a State ; concluding (v. 20) with the advice not to conspire against the latter however secretly, as it is impossible to tell how soon it may come to his knowledge.

Having now completed his researches into the obligations of man to himself, to his fellow-man, and to God ; and having stated the results in the shape of maxims for the conduct of life ; the Preacher proceeds in chap. xi., in the form of a peroration, to draw his subject to a close. He reverts once more to the duties which man owes to himself, and instructs him in what manner to make use of his possessions and to enjoy life. He advises him not to strive incessantly after riches, or selfishly to appropriate his acquisitions to his own exclusive use ; neither should he pass his days in apathetic indolence, but with cheerfulness and moderation enjoy the blooming peri-

od of youth. He then pronounces in chap. xii. the noble precept which crowns the entire production, and brings his self-imposed task to an end: "Remember thy Creator even in thy youth; before the unhappy days arrive, or the years approach, when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them."

The work closes with a description of the latter end of man, in which is depicted, in faithful colors and with a master hand, the gradual approach of old age and finally of death. On reaching the grave, he suggests (v. 7) the consoling thought of an after life to be spent in the presence of the Deity.

"Then shall the dust of the body return to the earth which it sprang from :

The spirit itself shall ascend, to dwell with its Giver on high."

Such is the object and such are the contents of that precious fragment of sacred oriental philosophy, the book of Ecclesiastes, through the whole of which is shadowed forth the sentiment contained in the concluding words, "Fear God, and keep his commandments."

ARTICLE IX.

STATE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Presbyterianism. A Review of the Leading Measures of the General Assembly of 1837. By a Member of the New York Bar.
New York : John S. Taylor, 1838. pp. 47.

By the Editor.

THE publication of this unpretending pamphlet stands connected with events of painful interest and of high and momentous bearing. It claims the attention of the friends of religion and of religious liberty on several accounts. It is not the production of a heated partizan, whose own acts and positions before the public imposed upon him the necessity of a public defence. The author had nothing at stake in the controversy of which he treats. He is neither a minister nor an elder, but an intelligent lawyer, of good reputation, and a private mem-

ber of the church. His mind, therefore, may be supposed to have been unbiassed by any personal or private interest in the questions at issue; and this, we think, is apparent from the candor and fairness which marks his discussion. He sketches with accuracy and clearness the origin and organization of the Presbyterian church and the prominent events in its history, which have led on to the existing controversy, and examines the great principles involved in it, with the freedom and directness of one whose only aim is to illustrate the true interests of both parties and the rights and duties of each. This he has accomplished with singular ability and in a manner to interest and instruct the candid reader.

It is not, however, principally, the candor and talent exhibited in this production, which have given it the importance we attach to it at the present time. Had it been issued a few months earlier, or a few days later, than the date of its actual publication,* it might have failed to accomplish the important and striking results which it seems already to have produced. It appeared at the very moment when a lucid and attractive discussion of the principal points embraced in it was especially needed to harmonize the views and concentrate the action of that portion of the church, who considered themselves as oppressed and injured by what they regarded the unconstitutional acts of the General Assembly of 1837. Had this been the result of contrivance, or of suggestion, by the leading men of that portion of the church who have availed themselves of the principles maintained in this publication, we should have regarded it with less admiration. But, assured as we are, that, while others, personally interested in the controversy, of both parties, were urging their conflicting views before the public, our author, unadvised by either, was pursuing his investigations, and while they were yet speaking, was unconsciously answering and refuting the positions of some, and confirming those of others, we are constrained to contemplate it as an agency especially excited and controlled by Him who seeth not as man seeth. It is this strikingly seasonable appearance of the publication before us, and its peculiar adaptation to meet and affect the crisis which was approaching, that has induced us to select it from the numerous documents, essays and opinions which have a bearing upon the existing controversies in the Presby-

* About the 25th of April, 1838.

terian church, and to place the title of it at the head of this article. Whatever may be its merits in other respects, it seems to have been the pivot on which the action of the church, in the constitution of its late General Assembly, has turned. It laid down in a condensed and popular form the most important of the constitutional and equitable principles, on which a large portion of the church have already taken their position and asserted their rights.

The result of the position here referred to was the organization, in Philadelphia, on the eighteenth of May last, of two bodies, each claiming to be "*The General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America.*" The majority of the members of each body will doubtless be sustained in their measures by the Presbyteries whose commissions they bore. Which of them will be sustained in law, remains to be decided by the civil tribunals, to which the parties have made their appeal, as we trust, in the fear of Him by whom princes reign and judges decree justice. But whatever may be ultimately decided to be the legal rights of the parties, *the church is in fact divided.*

This result we had for some months anticipated, with unfeigned reluctance and regret. We deprecated it as an evil and a reproach to be prevented, if possible. It was at length, however, rendered unavoidable, excepting by the surrender of rights and privileges, by a large portion of the church, which it seemed plainly their duty to maintain. We now contemplate it as one of those mysterious events in the Providence of God, by which he often confounds the wisdom of the wise, and makes his power and goodness known by means the most improbable to human appearance.

To us, the very reverse of the present position of the Presbyterian church would have seemed to be the attitude in which she ought to have stood forth, to exert the most benign and efficient influence on the advancement of the cause of Christ among men. Her constituent members and her ministry, from the commencement of her history in this country, have been among the most enlightened of our citizens. As a body they have been the friends of education, the warm and zealous patrons, not only of common schools, but of the higher seminaries of learning both classical and professional. Through their efficiency, with the blessing of God, the church has grown with the growth of the country, both in character and numbers,

until she has extended, with more or less effect, the enlightening, the elevating and saving influence of her ministrations over many millions of our population. Among the several denominations of American Christians, there was none which seemed to possess so many and so great facilities of usefulness. The total number of her communicants, as reported in the Minutes of the General Assembly of 1837, was 220,557, and the number of her ministers and licentiates, 2,420 ; and there probably does not exist on the face of the earth a denomination of Christians equally numerous and extended, among whom there prevails a greater uniformity of doctrinal belief. The differences which exist in this respect, excepting a few individual instances, are all of minor importance, and such as had ever been regarded, in this and in other denominations, as quite consistent with the preservation of the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Differences equally great, and in some cases the same, have prevailed in the Presbyterian church from her beginning, and have been tolerated through the whole progress of her history, excepting the period of her lamented division, from 1741 to 1758, at the close of which, by mutual concessions, the two Synods were happily united," though "there is not the least reason to believe that the members of either party really entertained essentially different opinions, on any important points, when they effected a union in 1758, from those which they entertained at the date of their schism in 1741."* There was, therefore, no sufficient reason for the existing division of the church, on the ground of differences of doctrinal belief, and no sufficient reason now exists, on this account, for the continuance of this division.

Eighteen months ago this noble and delightful communion was ONE. She had arisen from small beginnings in the infancy of the country, and had held on her way, with occasional interruptions, and through many trials for a century and a half. Many of her little ones, which had risen up in rapid succession, in the new settlements, had become thousands. The sphere of her direct ministrations, mingled with those of other denominations, had been extended over four fifths of the nation, and many of her ministers and members were foremost among American Christians, in their individual and associated efforts to promote those great objects of catholic christian benevolence, which have been prosecuted, with manifold blessings on our country

* See Miller's Letters to Presbyterians, p. 11.

and the world, by the American Bible, Tract, Sunday School, Education, Home and Foreign Missionary and other benevolent societies.

While she was thus watering others, and associating her influences with those of Christians of all other names, in the promotion of knowledge and religion, her own numbers were greatly multiplied by the outpouring of the Spirit of God upon many of her congregations. Her character and influence, with the exception of those internal conflicts which had begun to disturb and pervert the action of some of her judicatories, were admired and emulated by other denominations. Had she preserved her integrity and continued to cherish and exhibit the evangelical and catholic spirit, which had marked her proceedings in former years, she might have maintained in perpetuity, an influence for good on the cause of universal philanthropy, unequalled by that of any other single denomination of Christians. This was perceived and acknowledged by her most intelligent friends ; and a great majority of her members, no doubt, on both sides of the existing division, deeply felt both the importance and the responsibility of preserving the unity of the church entire and unbroken. But the accuser of the brethren had entered her judicatories. Whisperings and surmises against prominent individuals were spread among her members. Newspapers, which had been established for the purpose of circulating religious intelligence among the people, became the vehicles of attack upon personal character. Excitement and alarm were thus produced, and prosecutions for alleged heresy followed in their train ; parties were formed, and the higher and lower judicatories were, in several instances, arrayed against each other.

In this state of things the prevailing plans of promoting religious benevolence by Voluntary Societies were supposed to be favorable to the increase and prosperity of one of the parties. These, therefore, were assailed by the other party, as dangerous and inexpedient, and organizations were suggested and adopted by several judicatories, to counteract the influence of Voluntary Societies, and to prosecute the various objects of christian benevolence in a manner better suited to promote the interests and increase of the party adopting these organizations. One of these, "the Board of Missions of the General Assembly," was at length, in 1828, allowed the sanction of the highest judicatory of the church. Subsequently a similar organiza-

tion was adopted in regard to the education of candidates for the ministry. These gave ubiquity to a controversy which had been commenced on other grounds, and had hitherto been confined to certain sections of the church. The friends of Voluntary, Catholic Societies, on the one hand, and of Ecclesiastical, Sectarian Boards, on the other, were now, everywhere, urged to take their sides. Discussion on these topics became rife in the newspapers and periodicals. The results of these public appeals, and of the agencies employed, were every year reported to the General Assembly, and were there the occasions of arraying the parties against each other, till, at length, that judicatory, which had already consented to adopt sectarian organizations for Domestic Missions and Education, was strenuously urged in 1835 and 1836, to adopt another for Foreign Missions. It now became apparent also that the leading friends of this measure desired and designed, as soon as practicable, to supercede the action of all Voluntary Societies in the Presbyterian church by the organization of sectarian Boards for the prosecution of every object of christian benevolence. These efforts, though unavailing in the Assemblies of those years, were not without their effect in giving new vigor to the controversy which had already been waged in every section of the church. Yet, as we have said, *The church was one*. Her form, though marred, was not broken. Her representatives in the General Assembly of 1837 met as the judicatory of a united body. But they brought with them the elements of disruption. Measures had been previously concerted in a confidential "Convention" of one of the parties, and were carried in the Assembly, which, whatever may have been their design, have resulted in a formal division of the church, and have brought into question, before the civil tribunals of the country, the rights of two bodies, each representing, as far as yet appears, about equal portions of what was "the Presbyterian church in the United States," and each claiming to be the General Assembly of the same.

We will now state the grounds on which this division has been effected, or rather, on which that body, which, for the sake of distinction, is now currently denominated the "Constitutional General Assembly," has been organized. This we will do principally by quotations from the pamphlet before us, which, though they may fail to do justice to the strength of our author's continuous argument in support of the principles he advances, will place before the reader the principal points on which the

action of the Assembly turned. We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure, however, of first presenting the rapid sketch, by our author, of the history and progress of the Presbyterian church from its beginning, to the meeting of the General Assembly of 1837.—

“Presbyterians were among the first of those who sought, in our country, entire religious freedom. The organization of the Church, in its present form, however, is only coëval with the constitution of the United States. In 1788, there were but one Synod and seventeen Presbyteries in the country. The highest assembly in the Church, was the Synod of New-York and Philadelphia. This was so large, that it was decided to divide it into four Synods, and to form a new judicatory, to be composed of delegates from all the Presbyteries in the United States. This was done in that year, and thus a purely representative body—the highest Council, and the Court of last resort,—was created, and called, The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The powers and duties of all the courts and councils, were at this time prescribed and defined in a written constitution, which, by alterations and amendments, has become the present constitution.

“Every body knows how the spirit of our free institutions was the breath of a new life to our country, and how, after the adoption of the federal constitution in 1788, the nation spread onward into the wilderness. So, too, our Church, organized in the republican simplicity and equality of the New Testament, and recognizing and adopting the immutable principles of human rights, grew with the country, and spread onward and around, as the receding forests opened new regions to be christianized. As the Church grew, its Courts and Councils were multiplied. The growth was in the churches, by the mere addition of individual members. The multiplication of the judicatories, was by the totally different, but simple process of sub-division. Members were received into the churches by the sessions, and in this manner alone the Church grew. As the members increased, and emigrants settled in neighborhoods, separate churches were formed, and new pastors settled. The Presbyteries were thus enlarged, and parts were organized into new Presbyteries. The Synods, too, became inconveniently large, and parts were formed into separate Synods. Thus, not by the introduction of new elements, but by a continued division of the genuine old Presbyterian judicatories, the little assembly that met in apostolic harmony in 1789, grew into the great and discordant politico-religious multitude of 1837.

“While the Church was thus spreading over our vast territory, the

State of Connecticut was the hive, from which swarms of emigrants went to the fertile regions of the frontier. Our borders were principally occupied by Congregationalists, in connexion with the General Association of Connecticut, and by Presbyterians, in connection with the General Assembly. As for their common interest, they banded together against the savage and the wild beast, and joined hands in throwing up their dwellings and fortresses, without disputing about the fashion of either ; so, for their common faith and worship, they were willing to make common cause in building up churches, and securing and sustaining the protecting institutions of religion, without regard to the minor points of church government. Each yielded a little, that both might enjoy together, what neither could enjoy alone, the stated ministration of the gospel. To remove all objections, however, which might arise in any minds, to this noble, evangelizing spirit of charity, the highest Ecclesiastical Councils of the two sects, corresponded on the subject, and in 1801, only eleven years after the formation of the constitution, united in recommending a plan, by which the Congregationalist from Connecticut, and the Presbyterian in the new settlements, might unite in supporting the gospel. Its object was to prevent alienation, and to promote union and harmony. It enjoined on all the missionaries of both parties, the promotion of mutual forbearance and accommodation between the two sects. It recommended, in case of minister and people belonging to different sects, that all should maintain their respective forms of government and discipline, and preserve their ecclesiastical connection, settling their difficulties, between minister and people, by a sort of arbitration, or council, composed of half of each sect, unless all could agree to submit to the forms of the sect to which the minister should belong. In case of a mixture of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, in the same settlement, it recommended their uniting in one church, administering discipline by a committee from the communicants, with a right of appeal to the Presbytery or the Church, as the accused should be of one or the other sect. This was the "Plan of Union," and by its operation, the churches were rapidly extended. The stated ministrations of the Gospel, brought forth its appropriate fruits, and the plan of union remained undisturbed till 1837, a period of thirty-six years, during which time the "new settlements" of 1801, had become the populous cities—the rich and flourishing counties and States of 1837.

"During the last few years, various causes have operated in each General Assembly, to produce discord and contention. A large party, of great respectability, have been desirous of carrying certain measures, but being in the minority, have been, of course, defeated. They have not concealed their chagrin, and, finally, they attempted a system of party organization. They called a Convention to concert measures by which a majority might be secured in the

Assembly of 1837,* or failing in that, a secession produced. Their avowed purpose was to carry their measures, or "*dissolve the union*" of the Presbyterian church. The Convention met a few days previous to the meeting of the Assembly of 1837, and determined on their course. Unexpectedly, however, when the Assembly met, the disunionists† found themselves in the majority. They suddenly changed their course—entered, without sufficient deliberation upon ill-digested measures, and immediately proceeded to secure their conquest, by acts of nullification and exclusion—and, by imposing new tests, to prevent the popular voice from ever putting them again in the minority.

"It had been observed, that a large part of the representatives from the Presbyteries in Western New-York, and the Western Reserve, had usually voted against the wishes of the disunionists, and those regions were the "new settlements" of 1801, where the Plan of Union was designed to operate. The leading disunionists thought this furnished the means of getting rid of a troublesome minority—and, on their suggestion, the Assembly passed resolutions, without notice, abrogating the Plan of Union—excluding from the Church the Synods of the Western Reserve, Utica, Geneva, and Genessee—binding the clerk to enrol no commissioners to the next Assembly who should come from those regions; and denying to the representatives from new Presbyteries the right to sit in the Assembly, till after much of its important business be transacted, and even then, except by permission, on submitting to new tests. These acts were the more easily accomplished, inasmuch as the reading clerk, (whose whole duty it is to *read correctly*,) in reading the roll to take the questions, omitted, intentionally, the names of a large number of the unionists, who were actual, sitting members of the Assembly, and the moderator, and the Assembly, decided it was out of order for them to ask for the enjoyment of their privilege of voting.

* The first Convention of this kind which was avowedly called for the purpose of promoting party organization was that which was invited from Presbyteries and minorities of Presbyteries in the celebrated party paper denominated "The Act and Testimony," in June 1834, and which convened in Pittsburgh in 1835, a few days previous to the meeting of the General Assembly of that year. The influence of this Convention was found to be so efficacious, that the party were encouraged to call Conventions for similar purposes in 1837 and 1838.—*Ed.*

† The majority being changeable, the terms "majority" and "minority" are extremely inconvenient, as descriptive of the parties. The terms Old School and New School, being also liable to objection, as conveying no idea of the distinction between the parties, I have preferred the terms "disunionists" for the majority, on the leading measures in 1837, and "unionists" for the other party.

“Are these proceedings valid and binding on the Churches? What is their force and operation?”

“It is contended by the one party, that they are valid in their whole extent, and that by their fair construction and operation, they shut out from the Presbyterian Church, all the Courts and Councils, Synods, Presbyteries, Sessions and Churches—all the professing Christians, clergy and laity—men, women, and children, within the boundaries of the Synods of Utica, Geneva, Genessee, and the Western Reserve, amounting to about 500 ministers, and about 60,000 private Christians. The other party as confidently contends that the proceedings are all unconstitutional and void, and that the integrity of the Presbyterian Church is unimpaired, and its constituency undiminished.”

Our author proceeds to state the leading principles of the Presbyterian church government, the organization, rights and duties of Church Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and the General Assembly, and shows that “the great principles of American liberty are the foundation principles of religious liberty and of Presbyterian right in our church constitution.” He remarks truly, that “the only *punishments* known to the church constitution, are admonition, rebuke; suspension or exclusion from church privileges till repentance, and excommunication;—and in case of a minister, suspension and deposition from his office of bishop. ‘The highest punishment to which their authority extends,’ says the constitution, ‘is to exclude the contumacious and impenitent from the church.’ Declaring one out of the church is always a judicial sentence,” etc. He then raises the following inquiry:

“Tested by them,” (these principles,) “What becomes of the resolutions cutting off large portions of the Church? Construe them as we will, view them in any light, is it not true that they violate every one of these principles, and seem to have been passed in utter derision of all our Constitutional rights and safe-guards? The General Assembly, a mere appellate Court,—sitting in Philadelphia—has inflicted the highest ecclesiastical penalty on 60,000 laymen and 500 clergymen—residing in other States—many hundred miles distant—without notice—without accuser—without accusation—without citation—without proof or pretence of trial—without sentence—without naming an individual—or specifying an offence—and with the express admission, that an unknown, indefinite portion of them, were ‘strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and in order,’ and were guilty of nothing.”

These are the naked facts. Our author’s position is that

the resolutions referred to, if they have any force, are clearly equivalent to a sentence of excommunication, because there is no way, except by excommunication, in which a member can be put out of the church, unless it be by dismissal with recommendation to another church. Are these dismissed to another church? What church? Are these recommended?

The question then to be examined is, whether these resolutions can have any validity as resolutions of exclusion or excommunication? They are as follows.

“ ‘ But as the Plan of Union adopted for the new settlements in 1801, was originally an unconstitutional act on the part of that Assembly, these important standing rules having never been submitted to the Presbyteries; and as they were totally destitute of authority as proceeding from the General Association of Connecticut, which is invested with no power to legislate in such cases, and especially to enact laws to regulate churches not within her limits; and as much confusion and irregularity have arisen from this unnatural and unconstitutional system of union; therefore it is

“ Resolved, That the act of the Assembly of 1801, entitled a Plan of Union, etc. be, and the same is, hereby abrogated.

“ Resolved, That by the operation of the abrogation of the Plan of Union of 1801, the Synod of the Western Reserve is, and it is hereby declared to be, no longer a part of the Presbyterian church in the United States.

“ Be it resolved, by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America :

“ 1. That in consequence of the abrogation, by this Assembly, of the Plan of Union of 1801, between it and the General Association of Connecticut, as utterly unconstitutional, and therefore null and void from the beginning, the Synods of Utica, Geneva, and Genessee, which were formed and attached to this body, under and in execution of such Plan of Union, be, and they are hereby declared to be, out of the ecclesiastical connection of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, and not in form or fact an integral portion of said church.

“ 2. That the solicitude of this Assembly on the whole subject, and its urgency for the immediate decision of it, are greatly increased by reason of the gross disorders which are ascertained to have prevailed in those Synods, (as well as that of the Western Reserve, against which a declarative resolution, similar to the first of these, has been passed during our present session;) it being made clear to us, that even the Plan of Union itself was never consistently carried into effect by those professing to act under it.

“ 3. That the General Assembly has no intention by these resolutions, (or that passed in the case of the Synod of the Western

Reserve) to affect in any way the ministerial standing of any member of either of said Synods ; nor to disturb the pastoral relation in any church : nor to interfere with the duties or relations of private Christians in their respective congregations ; but only to declare and determine, according to the truth and necessity of the case, and by virtue of the full authority existing in it for that purpose, the relation of all said Synods, and all their constituent parts to this body—and to the Presbyterian church in these United States.

“ 4. That inasmuch as there are reported to be several churches and ministers, if not one or two Presbyteries, now, in connection with one or more of said Synods, which are strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and order : Be it therefore further resolved, that all such churches and ministers as wish to unite with us, are hereby directed to apply for admission into those Presbyteries, belonging to our connection, which are most convenient to their respective locations : and that any such Presbyteries as aforesaid, being strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and order, and now in connection with either of said Synods, as may desire to unite with us, are hereby directed to make application, with a full statement of their respective cases, to the next General Assembly, which will take proper order thereon.” ”

“ These resolutions, it will be seen are all made to depend upon the unconstitutional character of the Plan of Union. If the Plan of Union was constitutional, the resolutions fall of course to the ground. It is important, then, to inquire into its nature, and the consequences of its abrogation.”

As this “ Plan of Union” has come to be a document of so much importance in American church history, and also that the reader may appreciate the force of the remarks which follow, we deem it proper to give it a place in this review.

THE PLAN OF UNION.

From the Assembly's Digest, p. 297.

A Plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, in the new settlements, adopted in 1801.

“ Regulations adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in America, and by the General Association of the State of Connecticut, (provided said Association agree to them) with a view to prevent alienation, and promote union and harmony, in those new settlements which are composed of inhabitants from these bodies.

“ 1. It is strictly enjoined on all their missionaries to the new settlements, to endeavor, by all proper means, to promote mutual forbearance and accommodation between those inhabitants of the new settlements who hold the Presbyterian, and those who hold the Congregational form of church government.

“2. If in the new settlements, any church of the Congregational order shall settle a minister of the Presbyterian order, that church may, if they choose, still conduct their discipline according to Congregational principles, settling their difficulties among themselves, or by a council mutually agreed upon for that purpose: But if any difficulty shall exist between the minister and the church, or any member of it, it shall be referred to the presbytery to which the minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it; if not, to a council consisting of an equal number of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, agreed upon by both parties.

“3. If a Presbyterian church shall settle a minister of Congregational principles, that church may still conduct their discipline according to Presbyterian principles; excepting that if a difficulty arise between him and his church, or any member of it, the cause shall be tried by the Association to which the said minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it; otherwise by a council, one half Congregationalists and the other half Presbyterians, mutually agreed on by the parties.

“4. If any congregation consist partly of those who hold the Congregational form of discipline, and partly of those who hold the Presbyterian form; we recommend to both parties that this be no obstruction to their uniting in one Church and settling a Minister;—and that in this case, the Church choose a standing committee from the communicants of said Church, whose business it shall be to call to account every member of the church who shall conduct himself inconsistently with the laws of Christianity, and to give judgment on such conduct; and if the person condemned by their judgment be a Presbyterian, he shall have liberty to appeal to the Presbytery; if a Congregationalist, he shall have liberty to appeal to the body of the male communicants of the Church; in the former case, the determination of the Presbytery shall be final, unless the Church consent to a further appeal to the Synod, or to the General Assembly; and in the latter case, if the party condemned shall wish for a trial by a mutual council, the cause shall be referred to such council. And provided the said standing committee of any church shall depute one of themselves to attend the Presbytery, he may have the same right to sit and act in the Presbytery, as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church.”

Our author reviews this “Plan of Union” at length, and shows that it was a plan *solely for the new settlements*;—that it was confined to new settlements *composed of inhabitants in connection with the General Assembly and the General Association of Connecticut*. “It did not embrace Congregationalists from the rest of New England. Congregationalists from Massachusetts were no more embraced in it than Quakers from Rhode Island;” etc.—Its object was to promote union and har-

mony between *individuals* of the two sects in certain circumstances, while it was not intended to affect the membership or ecclesiastical connection of clergy or laity in either denomination. From all this our author concludes that neither its existence nor abrogation could affect the integrity of the Presbyterian church in the slightest degree. He adds :

“ It was essentially a missionary plan—an evangelizing scheme, and entirely within the power of the Assembly to recommend. (What may they not recommend?) The Assembly of 1801 was as competent to make it as the Assembly of 1837 to unmake it; and both were entirely competent to do so. *It was not in any sense a contract.* Neither the Assembly, nor the Association, nor the two sects, nor any individuals or bodies of men, thereby agreed to do, or to omit to do any act, or to exercise or to waive any right. *It was not a standing rule or a constitutional rule,* to be submitted to the Presbyteries. It is an abuse of language to call it either the one or the other. It was no rule at all. It prescribed nothing, commanded nothing, required nothing. It asked for no obedience, contemplated no responsibility, inflicted no punishment. It neither restrained nor constrained any man or body of men. How idle then, on the one hand, to contend that it could not be made by one Assembly, and on the other, that it could not be rescinded by a succeeding Assembly! It was clearly, in any just view of the nature of the Plan itself, liable to be abandoned or rescinded, at pleasure.

“ It was subject to be rescinded also for a higher reason. The General Assembly has no perpetuity of mind or body. Each Assembly is independent of another. In all matters of advice, recommendation, and general action,—as a Council,—one Assembly has no constitutional right to bind another Assembly. What one Assembly can do, another can undo, with the exception of judicial decisions. One Assembly cannot reverse the judicial decision of another Assembly; but it is its clear right to decide a precisely similar case in a directly opposite manner.

“ The Assembly then had abundant power to abrogate the Plan of Union, and by their resolution passed on the 23d May, 1837, it was abrogated. It was *thereby* abrogated. It was *then* abrogated. It existed till that time, and no longer. And the only consequence that could follow from rescinding the Plan would be, that from that day, there would be no longer any Plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the new settlements, in the support of the Gospel. Each sect must stand alone, and bear its own burdens. Whether its operation brought any one into the church or not, its abrogation could turn no one out of the Church: members are not thus turned out of the Church. Then its abrogation would draw after it no such consequences as the disunionists supposed, and by their

resolutions of exclusion declared. It could by no possibility have a retroactive effect, or an expulsive effect.”*

The *declaration* of the resolutions in question, therefore, was absurd. They declare certain Synods to be “no longer a part,” “an integral portion” of the Presbyterian church! A Synod is not a part of the church, but a local court, created by the church, for the convenience and protection of a portion of its members. The church is composed of its members, and not of its courts.

“If, by any means,” says our author, “there should be neither Assembly, nor Synod, nor Presbytery in the whole Church, still the Church would be as perfect and complete, and as large as ever—none of its parts would be gone, and it would be entirely competent to create and organize anew all its judicatories. Here lies the great fallacy of these resolutions: they seem to consider a Synod, and those individuals who sit in it, and all those who live within the circuit of its jurisdiction, as the same idea. It can have been nothing but this confusion of ideas, and the sweeping, uncertain, and indistinct character of these resolutions, that blinded the eyes of many who voted for them.”

Again. No man can be affected by such resolutions as these, unless he can be identified. The resolutions, therefore, are clearly void for uncertainty, in regard to individuals. Nor can the disowning of Synods by the General Assembly, in any manner affect the existence and integrity of Presbyteries, because the Presbyteries and they only are represented in the Assembly. These and several other points of importance to his argument, our author urges with great force and directness, in most of which we doubt not his correctness, though, in regard to some of them, we have been accustomed to entertain different views. In the general conclusion to which he arrives, however, we entirely concur, viz: “*That in every view of the case, the constituency of the General Assembly remains the same, as in former years, and that great judicatory of the church is itself untouched and unimpaired by these resolutions.*” Notwithstanding the unconstitutional acts of the General

* In the foregoing positions our author is fully sustained by the legal opinions of G. Wood, Esq. and Chancellor Kent of New York, excepting that the latter was inclined to treat the “Plan of Union” as a contract between the Gen. Assembly and the Gen. Association.—*Ed.*

Assembly of 1837, all the Presbyteries were as competent to form, by their commissioners, the General Assembly of 1838, as they had ever been to form any previous Assembly.

“What, then,” says our author, “will constitute the General Assembly of 1838? It must be chosen in the same manner as the last, that is, it must be chosen by all the Presbyteries, which choose to be represented. “The General Assembly shall represent in one body *all* the particular churches of this denomination.” “It shall be denominated the *General Assembly*.” “The General Assembly shall consist of an equal delegation of bishops and elders from *each Presbytery*.” The delegates or commissioners are appointed by all the Presbyteries “to consult, vote and determine, *on all things* that may come before that body.” They are all equal in power and right—all are appointed in the same manner, and bring the same evidence of it. If any have superiority, whence do they derive it? etc. It is not necessary that they should all be present, but none must be excluded who bring the proper evidence of their appointment.” * * * * If some are excluded, it is not a judicatory of the *whole* Church—it does not “represent in one body all the particular Churches”—it is not “the bond of union, peace, correspondence and mutual confidence among *all* our Churches”—it has no right to “superintend the concerns of the whole Church”—it is not the “General Assembly,” etc.

Any fourteen or *more* of these commissioners, one half of whom shall be ministers, being met, on the day and at the place appointed, shall be a quorum for the transaction of business.” Any number, “being met,” are necessary to form a quorum. Fourteen are not a quorum, if there be more there. No business can be transacted unless there be a quorum. It is not the General Assembly till there is a quorum competent to transact business; and there cannot constitutionally be a quorum for the transaction of business, if any of “fourteen or more, being met,” are excluded or debarred from their participation in the transaction of business. On any other construction, there might be a dozen quorums of the General Assembly competent to transact business, which is absurd. These principles are so universally received and acted on in all the transactions of public affairs, that it is believed that the whole history of deliberative bodies, no matter with what factious zeal or unprincipled party-spirit they may have been characterized, does not furnish an instance, in which it was ever before pretended, that a part of a body of directors, trustees, managers, representatives, of any sort could exclude their associates, and legally exercise the authority of the whole, except such were the express terms of their association.”

These are the principles which are maintained in the Essay before us. They were brought before the public in several

newspapers, and in the pamphlet under review, a few weeks before the meeting of the General Assembly in May last. They were not new. Most of them had been urged in other essays, speeches and publications, but they were here combined and clearly stated, and supported by an array of arguments which left no longer any ground of doubt or hesitation as to their substantial correctness. They were accordingly adopted and acted on with great unanimity, by almost the entire number of the commissioners to the General Assembly of 1838, who were opposed to the excising acts of the Assembly of 1837.

As was expected, the clerks of the former Assembly, in obedience to the order of that Assembly, and in fulfilment of their pledge or promise to the same, made out a partial roll of the Assembly of 1838, declining to receive the commissions and to record the names of the commissioners from all the Presbyteries within the bounds of the disowned Synods. The names of the said commissioners were then tendered to the Moderator, and a motion made and duly seconded that that roll be completed by their insertion. The Moderator declared the motion out of order. The member proposing it appealed to the Assembly from this decision. The Moderator declared this also out of order, and refused to put the appeal. This was regarded as a palpable refusal of the Moderator to discharge the duties of his office, and, as, by virtue of his having been the Moderator of the last preceding Assembly, he was by constitution declared to be the Moderator of the present Assembly only "until another should be appointed in his place," a commissioner present, whose name was already enrolled, nominated another commissioner to be now appointed Moderator of this Assembly. This nomination being duly seconded, was put to vote by the individual who made the nomination, and carried in the affirmative by a large majority, very few being heard to vote in the negative; whereupon the Commissioner named was declared to be duly elected Moderator of the General Assembly for the time being. The Clerks, who had refused to receive and record the names of certain commissioners, were then superseded by the appointment of others in their place,—the roll was completed by adding the names of all the commissioners present, which had been omitted, and the General Assembly was organized, as is claimed, in all respects, according to the Constitution.

In the mean time, that portion of the Commissioners present, who approved of the excising resolutions of the General As-

sembly of 1837, refused to act with the Assembly constituted as above, and proceeded to constitute what they also claim to be *the General Assembly*. Their proceedings, in the matter of organization, as far as we know, with the exception of their having excluded from their seats the commissioners above referred to, were according to the constitution and usages of the church. Thus have been constituted two bodies each claiming to be *The General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States*. Each of these bodies proceeded to perform according to their best discretion, all the acts and duties required to be done by the highest judicatory of the church. These acts conflicting, as they do, with each other, and in some cases involving the rights of property, as well as constitutional privileges and duties, have imposed upon the adherents of both bodies the necessity of an appeal to the civil tribunals of the country to determine which of the two is in law, and in fact, the *Constitutional General Assembly*. Prosecutions, we understand, have already been commenced for the settlement of the great question at issue.

We hardly need to remark, that this is a state of things deeply to be deplored, not only by Presbyterians, but by Christians generally. The collisions which have resulted in this separation, have brought great reproach upon the cause of religion; and the result itself is reproachful. It is but little relief to our own feelings to say that separation is better than for the parties to have remained in one body, to contend with each other before a gazing world, as they have done for several years past. To make the best of it, the alternative is but the substitution of one evil for another; and upon the authors of the former, of whatever party, whose acts and doings have created a necessity for the latter, there rests a tremendous responsibility.

These two divisions of the once united Presbyterian church, will hereafter constitute two denominations of Presbyterians. One of the Assemblies recently in session, will in due time, be determined to be the legal successor of the General Assembly of 1837. That one and each future Assembly which shall be formed in pursuance of the position which it has assumed, by commissioners from all the Presbyteries which choose to be thus represented, will, of right, retain the name and authority of the "*General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States*." The other Assembly, with its successors, will inherit

no rights from its predecessors, but will acquire new rights by the action of such Presbyteries as shall choose to constitute such Assemblies, either under the provisions of the present "Form of Government," or any other which they shall adopt. Which of the two bodies shall be reduced to this alternative, we need not be especially solicitous. It will be the duty of the parties, as citizens, no less than as Christians, to respect the decisions of the tribunals to which they are amenable. Both parties should remember that the success of either in establishing its claim, before a civil court, to the rights and privileges of the General Assembly, under the present constitution, is but a minor interest, not worthy to be compared with the greater duties and responsibilities which devolve upon both these divisions of the church, in the positions which they have respectively taken; and worse even, than division, will be the result, if the strength of these bodies shall be frittered away and lost in contending for their claimed inheritance. While the question on this subject is pending, let not the parties delay their work as Christians, as ministers, and as members of the church universal. A name to live, though it be supported by the best evidences of orthodoxy, or sustained by the laws of the land, will not constitute success in this conflict. There can be no desirable triumph to either party, excepting that which shall be celebrated in the songs of the redeemed rescued from perdition and restored to the favor of God through its instrumentality. "And here," in the language of the late Dr. Rice of Virginia, "is the fairest opportunity for that party which has the best spirit, and the most of truth on their side, to gain the victory. For, my life on it, in this age, those who do most to build up the kingdom of the Redeemer, will prevail."

ARTICLE X.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

- 1.—*Researches into the Physical History of Mankind. By James Cowles Prichard, M. D. F. R. S. M. R. I. A., Corresponding Member of the National Institute of France, Honorary Fellow of King's and Queen's College of Physicians in Ireland, Member of the Royal Academy of Medicine of Paris. Third Edition.* London, 1836—7. Vols. I. and II. pp. 376, 373.

Dr. Prichard, the author of the volumes before us, has already made himself favorably known to the literary and scientific world. Besides the former editions of the present work, he has published a *Treatise on Insanity*, said to be the best work on mental derangement in the English language; a *Review of the Doctrine of a Vital Principle*; and a learned *Analysis of the Egyptian Mythology*. The diversities of structure in the human family early engaged his attention, and in 1808 he selected this subject for the argument of a Latin inaugural essay, printed at that time. The same treatise was translated and enlarged in 1813, and under this new form it made the first edition of the present work. After further and laborious investigation he brought out a second edition in 1826, to which in 1831 he added an able philological essay on the eastern origin of the Celtic nations, proved by a comparison of their dialects with the Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and Teutonic nations. He now presents to the public a third edition. In the words of the author "each edition has been almost entirely written anew: every topic comprised in it has been reconsidered, with the advantage of such additional information as I have been in the interval enabled to acquire."

The *Physical History, or Physiognomical Ethnography* of the human race is a department of knowledge of the most recent date—indeed it owes its origin to an author now living, Professor Blumenbach of Göttingen. Dr. Prichard had, however, thought deeply upon the subject before the works of Blumenbach fell into his hands, and with these for a foundation it has been presented in a better form and with clearer illustration. The comparative physiology and psychology of the different human races has never before been made the express subject of inquiry.

In the first of these volumes, Dr. Prichard has impartially investigated the question with regard to the unity of the origin of the human races, which he successfully endeavors to decide by analogies

* *Lectures on Physiology, Zoology, and the Natural History of Man.* London, 1819.

drawn from the vegetable and animal world. He takes a stand (in which Lawrence* agrees with him,) in opposition to the French philosophers who openly proclaim in defiance of the sacred Writ the diversity of origin of whites, negroes, etc. etc. The degrading theories of Voltaire, Desmoulins, Rudolphi, Bory de St. Vincent, Virey, and Lamarck, are satisfactorily confuted, and the truth of the Mosaic account is fully substantiated.

Researches into the physical ethnography of the African races, with comparative vocabularies of African languages and dialects are comprised in the second volume of the third edition. The soundness of his arguments, the clear and philosophical language which he employs, together with his extensive information and unwearied industry, render Dr. Prichard's work highly instructive, as well as essentially different, and more satisfactory than any other treatise on the same subject. "It would be difficult," says Dr. Wiseman, "for any one in future to treat of the physical history of man without being indebted to Dr. Prichard for a great portion of his materials."*

The work will probably extend to several volumes, as by far the most interesting and the largest portion of the human family is yet left uninvestigated.

2.—*A Popular Treatise on Medical Philosophy, or an Exposition of Quackery and Imposture in Medicine. By Caleb Ticknor, M. D., Author of "The Philosophy of Living" (No. 77, Harpers' Family Library.)* New York: Gould and Newman, 1838, pp. 242.

Effectually to put down quackery is a bold undertaking. Yet we are told in the preface to this work that the author aims at nothing less. We highly applaud his motives, and wish him all possible success. We feel an unfeigned respect for his talents and amiable qualities, and have no doubt his work will be the means of great good. We must however express the belief that the foundation of quackery lies too deep in the constitution of our nature to be thus easily cured; it is the *vulnus irremediabile* of the body social, and all the hellebore that ever grew in Anticyra cannot purge it away. Is it not so? Lord Bacon tells us that "witches and impostors have always held a competition with physicians." Old Galen complains of the same, and observes that his patients were more obedient to the oracle in the temple of Aesculapius, and to their own dreams, than to his prescriptions. The philosophic Cicero and Aurelian were under the influence of medical superstition, and even Lord Bacon believed in the influence of charms and amulets. The great Boyle recommended the thigh bone of an executed criminal as a specific in dysentery. Dr. Johnson believed in *second sight*, and all have read of the *sympathetic powder* of Sir Kenelm Digby, which was believed to

* Lectures, p. 112.

cure any wound, by its application to the weapon which caused the injury.

To come down to our own times, have we not seen almost whole communities spell-bound, for a time, in the belief of the efficacy of the royal touch ;—of the successive manipulations of the seventh son ;—of natural bone-setters ;—of homoöpathia and animal magnetism ;—and have not all the vagaries and absurd conceits of the last been endorsed by men of high reputation ? And if, at any time, there are symptoms of returning sense in the community, do we not immediately see signs of another plague of frogs, or lice, or something yet more loathsome, coming up to devour the land ?

The work before us deserves more than a passing notice. It is a philosophical treatise, giving an account of the origin of medicine, a general view of the human body and its divisions ;—the anatomy and diseases of the digestive organs, a description of the organs of respiration, of the cutaneous system,—of the eye,—of female complaints,—of rheumatism,—of deafness,—of cancer,—of measles,—of natural bone-setters,—of the comparative powers of vegetable and mineral medicines,—of the errors, exclusiveness and ultraism of medical men, and their influence in causing and perpetuating empiricism ;—and, last, though not least in importance, we have a chapter on the influence of clergymen in the cause and spread of quackery.

The aim of the author was to spread before the public, in a cheap and condensed form, a sufficient amount of anatomical and physiological truth to serve as an antidote to all the varieties of quackery which may arise. The plan, it must be acknowledged, is a good one. It is indeed the only plan adapted to have any effect. Mere declamation here is useless. Still we adhere to our opinion that the case is a hopeless one, and he must be a very sanguine man who thinks differently.

While we admit the general excellence of the matter of this volume, we have some misgivings with regard to the wisdom or correctness of the fifteenth chapter, “on the errors, exclusiveness and ultraism of medical men,” etc. Is such an *exposé* as this likely to put down quackery ? We humbly opine that its tendency is to increase it. If our author’s representations here were wholly true, we should almost be ready to enrol ourselves the disciples of Brandreth in Physic and of Graham in diet, and bid defiance to the medical profession. But with all deference, we conceive the doctor has rather overstated the case of his medical brethren. He has aimed to make a strong case without stopping at every step to inquire whether his positions were all just. We refer to this chapter throughout, but especially to pages 233 and 234. However physicians may differ among themselves in theory, we believe that in the treatment of acute diseases, which constitute an immense majority of cases, they do not materially vary in practice.

Those who have read the "Philosophy of Living," by the same author, need not be told that Dr. Ticknor's style is easy, natural and elegant. An air of simplicity and earnestness characterizes his works. Sanguine in temperament, his views partake in some degree of his own ardor, and designed as they are to promote the best interests of society, and to counteract the various forms of error, we cannot but hope and believe that the present work will rival the former in usefulness and popularity.

3.—*Professor Bush's Commentary on Genesis.* New York, 1838.

We have received a few of the first pages of this Commentary. It is much in the form of Mr. Barnes's Notes on the New Testament. We have before, frequently, expressed our high opinion of the value of Mr. Bush's exegetical labors. His remarks exhibit extensive learning, yet modestly and not unnecessarily protruded, and the happy talent of exhibiting perspicuously and briefly the meaning of the sacred writers, while his moral reflections are generally pertinent and striking. It is not a *preaching* commentary, but a thoroughly exegetical one, and well adapted both to the learned and the common reader. The theories which are occasionally advanced to account for particular facts are not dogmatically propounded, and serve, on the whole, to give liveliness and interest to the observations. Professor Bush has had extensive opportunities to become thoroughly versed in the great department of biblical illustration. The pages before us give the rich fruits of that knowledge. The author's mind is too candid and liberal to induce him to wish that others should accord with him on every point, at least until after thorough examination. With many of the notes on the first chapter of Genesis we entirely concur. Respecting the correctness of a few statements we are in doubt. On p. 26 it is remarked, that "it is a matter rather of rational inference than of express revelation, that the material universe was *created out of nothing*." Yet it is such an inference as cannot be resisted without doing violence to the fundamental laws of human belief." It appears to us, however, that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews asserts directly, 11:2, that the world was created by God out of nothing. 'The things which are seen, i. e. the visible universe, were not made of things which do appear.' The *τὸ ἐκ μὴ φαινόμενον* would be equally conclusive against any pre-existing materials, to whatever geological theory we may be attached. Prof. Bush adopts, p. 31, with some distinguished geologists, the theory of indefinite days. If the fact adduced by geologists (see Introduction to Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise) be well established, that of the 3000 species of the fossil remains of plants and animals, in the tertiary formation, less than 600 are identical with living species, while the mass of those that are identical, occur in the uppermost members even of the tertiary strata, or, in other

words, that the fossil remains do not correspond with the order of the six days' creation, then the theory of indefinite days is unsound and unnecessary. Bib. Repos. VI. 309. "*And for days and years.* As the word *for* is here omitted before *years*, though occurring before each of the other terms, the sense of the phrase is undoubtedly 'for days *even* years;' implying that a *day* is often to be taken for a *year*, as is the case in prophetic compilations." We think that it is much more probable that days here means twenty-four hours only, and that there is an ellipsis of $\frac{1}{2}$ before שָׁנָה . The Septuagint has $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. Mr. Bush's theory in respect to the topography of Eden is, that it embraced the countries known at present as Cabool, Persia, Armenia, Koordistan, Syria, Arabia, Abyssinia and Egypt. The Pison is supposed to be the Indus, the Gihon, the Nile, and Havilah to be situated on the borders of India. There are, unquestionably, serious difficulties connected with either of the almost innumerable hypotheses on the topography of Eden. Yet the one which assigns the location to Armenia is, we are constrained to believe, the most probable. Some of the other theories assume that the deluge produced greater changes in the earth than seem to have been possible, or at least probable.

4.—*The True Intellectual System of the Universe: Wherein all the reason and philosophy of atheism is confuted, and its impossibility demonstrated. Also a Treatise on Immutable Morality; with a Discourse concerning the true notion of the Lord's Supper; and two Sermons on 1 John 2: 3, 4 and 1 Cor. 15: 57. By Ralph Cudworth, D. D. With references to the several quotations in the Intellectual System, and an account of the Life and Writings of the Author: By Thomas Birch, M. A. F. R. S. First American Edition. In two volumes. Andover and New York: Gould & Newman, 1838. pp. 804, 756.*

Dr. Cudworth was born, in 1617, at Aller, in Somersetshire, of which parish his father was rector. He was admitted a pensioner at Emanuel College, Cambridge, at the age of 13. His diligence as an academical student was very great; and, in 1639, he took the degree of M. A., and was elected fellow of his college. He became so distinguished as a tutor, that the number of his pupils exceeded all precedent. In due time, he was presented by his college to the rectory of North Cadbury in Somersetshire. In 1642, he took the degree of B. D., and was chosen master of Clare Hall, and, in the following year, was made Regius professor of Hebrew. In 1651, he was made D. D., and in 1654, was chosen master of Christ's college, Cambridge. Here, in the bosom of his family, he spent the remainder of his days. In 1678, he published his great work, *The Intellectual System*. The moral as well as mental character of this

distinguished scholar stood very high, and he died universally lamented, in 1688, in the 71st year of his age.

The Intellectual System was intended, in the first instance, to be an essay against the doctrine of necessity only ; but perceiving that this doctrine was maintained by different individuals on various grounds, he arranged these opinions under three separate heads, which he intended to treat of in three books ; but his Intellectual System relates only to the first, viz. " The material Necessity of all things without a God, or absolute Atheism."

Many of our readers will welcome this handsome American edition of this great man's works. The matter which, in the English editions, is contained in two cumbersome quartos or in four octavos, is here comprised in two compact octavos, besides embracing what none of the English editions of the Intellectual System do contain, the profound and noble treatise on Immutable Morality. This latter has long been out of print. It was published more than forty years after the author's death by Dr. Edward Chandler, bishop of London. It is in fact, though not professedly, an answer to the writings of Hobbes and of some other infidels whose opinions took away the essential and immutable distinctions between moral right and wrong. In addition to these various treatises, and Dr. Birch's Life of Dr. Cudworth, there is subjoined an analysis of the whole, amounting to nearly 150 pages, which forms a very enlightened abstract or abridgment of the various treatises.

5.—*Lectures on the principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, delivered at St. Mary's Moorfields, during the Lent of 1836. By Nicholas Wiseman, D. D. Professor in the university of Rome, foreign member of the Royal Society of Literature, corresponding member of the Royal Asiatic Society. 2 vols. 12mo. 1836. pp. 332, 244.*

We have entertained a high opinion of the candor and talents of Dr. Wiseman. His Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion furnished conclusive evidence, we thought, of a discriminating, liberal and philosophical mind—a mind well disciplined, open to evidence, not bigotted, and intently seeking information from all accessible sources. The Lectures do not profess to be profound, and original investigations on the various subjects which pass under review. But they appear to be a well-condensed outline of the most important facts in the recent developments of science and literature which go to establish the authority of revealed religion. As such they have commended themselves to the favorable attention of some of our best scholars, and of the conductors of our principal magazines, as the North American Review and the American Journal of Science. In these Lectures, Dr. Wiseman does not hold the pen of a partizan, or of a Roman Catholic, but of a well-read scholar.

What then was our surprise on opening the volume on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church. A more unfair, one-sided, dishonest diatribe our eyes never beheld than is contained in Lectures VI. and VII. on the practical success of the Protestant and Catholic Rule of Faith in converting heathen nations. It would do honor to the most fervent and sturdy disciple of Inigo de Loyola. We will proceed to substantiate our allegation by sufficient proofs.

1. Criminal want of care in seeking information concerning Protestant missions. Vol. II. p. 166, Dr. W. says "I have not always had the convenience of consulting documents down to the very latest period; and I have therefore been obliged to content myself with such as have come within my reach. I mention this cautionary circumstance for this purpose, that, if I do not always quote the notices received within this and the last year, it may not be supposed that I have been ruled by a wish to avoid what might appear adverse to my assertions." But why did he not get the latest information? Why depend on Reports several years old, when in half an hour, he could have obtained, gratuitously, the Reports of the very year, 1836, when he was lecturing and writing? He quotes the Report of 1828 of a Protestant minister in Canada, Dr. Morse's Universal Geography 1812, from Henry Martyn's Memoir published more than 20 years ago, and from some remarks of Gordon Hall made at Bombay in 1825. On p. 184, he says: "I may briefly mention the mission which was attempted to be established, in the Burmese empire, by means of Mr. Judson and his lady. They resided there and, consequently, these results are from their own confession; that after being there seven years, they had not made a single convert; that, after the seventh year, they received one, and that he afterwards brought another, so that in the end they had four proselytes; when in consequence of the war breaking out, the mission was broken up." This is Dr. Wiseman's account of the American Baptist mission in Burmah, which, by the way, he confounds with the English Baptist mission in Calcutta. This he would give as the *present* results of the Burman mission, when, if he had consulted the London Missionary Register, with which he seems to be acquainted, he would have found in the No. for February 1836, that *four hundred and forty-four* natives had been received into the communion of the Baptist churches in Burmah.

2. Dr. Wiseman frequently quotes authorities who are secretly or openly, the enemies of all missions. Such are the London Quarterly Review, the British Critic, the Asiatic Journal, the Nouveau Journal Asiatique, Capt. Basil Hall, Klaproth and Gambia. What must we think of a writer who will quote such authorities as the "voyage of H. M. S. Blonde to the Sandwich Islands," "Kotzebue's Second Voyage round the world," and Augustus Toole's "account of a nine month's Residence in New Zealand?" Yet he says he "quotes no authorities which can be considered hostile to missionary societies."

3. When

he extracts from our own authorities, he extracts only what is most discouraging; he dwells at large on the history of a decayed mission; he shows where the Moravians have *failed*; he parades the most desponding sentiments of a disheartened missionary. *A.* He generally passes over in perfect silence the most popular and important missions. He makes not the slightest allusion to the Tinnelly mission, which in 1829 contained 6243 souls who were so far Christians as to have renounced idolatry. He refers not at all to the Church mission in New Zealand, to the American mission in Ceylon, to none of the missions in South Africa. In respect to the West Indies, where the glorious triumphs of the gospel are recorded and known the world over, unless it be at Rome, he merely says in a note, "I regret being obliged from fear of becoming tiresome, to omit the history of attempted conversion in the West Indies, where the series of failures is as remarkable as in the other parts of the world of which I have treated." 5. When Dr. W. happens to meet with some instances of Protestant conversions, he explains them away by assigning them to secular causes, local influence, etc. 6. He gives the most exaggerated statements of the success of the Roman Catholic missions, past and present. But we have no space to enlarge.

These Lectures of Dr. Wiseman are well worth reading, notwithstanding. There is no want of plausibility, of acuteness, of powers of reasoning, and of information respecting the Roman Catholic Church. We may be sure that the author has made the best of his cause. The subjects of the Lectures are the Protestant rule of faith, the Catholic rule of faith, authority of the Church, practical success of the two rules of faith, supremacy of the pope, penance, satisfaction and purgatory, indulgences, invocations of saints, their relics and images, and transubstantiation.

6.—*Life and Select Discourses of the Rev. Samuel H. Stearns.*
Boston: Josiah A. Stearns, 1838. pp. 410.

Among the thoughts which have crowded upon us in reading this memoir is the truth of the inspired declaration "that the heart knoweth its own bitterness." Not strangers alone, but even intimate friends cannot always "intermeddle" with it. Mr. Stearns generally wore an air of unaffected cheerfulness. Mingled with his habitual thoughtfulness, there was sometimes a playful manner and a joyousness of spirits which little betrayed the tender melancholy and sadness, sometimes amounting to deep depression, which characterized his inward life. We do not mean that there was a contrariety between his feelings and actions. No one was less chargeable with dishonesty or pretension. Neither did he cherish a murmuring spirit at the dispensations of his heavenly Father. But with an uncommon union of the powers of reasoning and of imagination, with a highly

cultivated taste, with a lofty standard of moral and intellectual excellence, with warm and generous feelings, with a peculiarly susceptible temperament, and surrounded by strong-minded and strong-bodied associates who were pressing on, unretarded, in the path of honorable usefulness—Mr. Stearns had, for many years,—an adequate cause for melancholy—a *broken physical constitution*. From his junior year in college till his death, he was a weak, if not a sick man. No dependence could be placed on the fragile tenement. Hope was strong and elastic, only to be disappointed. Many times did he essay to labor in his Master's vineyard, even if it were but for a "little season," but his shattered energies refused their aid, and nothing remained but a suspension or abandonment of the dearly loved pursuit. Yet there were not wanting those who blamed him for not sooner accepting some one of the numerous invitations which were tendered to him to settle as a christian pastor. But such persons did not know him. They mistook his generally serene countenance and upright gait as the index of considerable, if not entire, bodily energies. They did not know that the strings of the pleasant harp were broken. They could not read the secret history of his mind, or if not absolutely secret, known to but few of his friends. He longed for the pastoral office. He "stretched out his hands" towards the good work, but it fled from his embrace.

Mr. Stearns was the eldest son of the Rev. Samuel Stearns, the late beloved minister of Bedford, Ms. He was born Sept. 12, 1801. In 1816, he entered Phillips Academy, in Andover. In June 1817, he became a member of his father's church. In 1819, he entered Harvard University. At his graduation in 1823, he gave the salutatory addresses in Latin. On taking his second degree in 1826, he delivered the master's valedictory in Latin. From the autumn of 1823 to the spring of 1825, he was an assistant teacher in Phillips Academy. In December, 1825, he joined the theological seminary in the same place, where he remained three years. From 1830 to 1834, he preached, occasionally, in various places, always with much acceptance. April 16, 1834, he was ordained over the Old South Church in Boston. But in two or three sabbaths, his strength was wholly gone. After resorting to various means for the recovery of his wasted powers, a voyage to Europe was determined upon. He sailed for London June 8, 1836. He travelled extensively in Great Britain, France, Switzerland and Germany, and spent the winter of 1836—7 in Italy. In the spring of 1837, he returned to Paris to die. This event took place May 15, 1838. His remains were brought to this country, and interred, with many tears, at Mount Auburn.

Fraternal affection has well performed the biographical office. All is done which we could desire. Every thing is in taste and in excellent keeping with the subject of the memoir. The mechanical

execution of the volume is beautiful. We have seen no American biography which will compare with it, in this respect. About one half of the volume is occupied with the memoir, and the other half with the sermons and other compositions of Mr. Stearns. No cultivated and christian mind will be tempted to stop till the volume is read through.

7.—*A Critical Grammar of the Hebrew Language: By Isaac Nordheimer, doctor in philosophy of the university of Munich, Professor of Arabic, Syriac and other oriental languages in the university of the city of New York.* New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1838. Vol. I. pp. 280.

Our first remark in relation to this Grammar is the exceeding correctness with which it is printed. The difficulties of reaching, not an immaculate text, for that is out of the question, but a text which may be pronounced accurate, are known only to the few who have made the attempt where there is a profusion of Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac points and letters. The printer, Mr. B. L. Hamlen of New Haven, Ct., and the superintendent of the press, Mr. Turner, deserve great credit for their successful pains. But few books, exclusively, English, are more handsomely printed than this Grammar. We have read many pages without noticing any material errors which are not marked in the errata. We have not, however, critically examined the volume in respect to this point.

Our second remark is, that the author evidently possesses rich stores of oriental learning. He familiarly illustrates his positions not only from the dialects kindred to the Hebrew, but from Persian, Sanscrit, etc. He seems to have shared largely in that faculty and diligence in acquiring languages for which the Germans are so renowned. Our author's production exhibits not the mere appearance, but the results, of extensive and profound personal researches. We presume that the grammar will receive attention in the native land of the author, and not simply in the country of his adoption. While he pays all suitable acknowledgments to the great name and merits of Gesenius, he does not blindly follow him, nor any other master. He gives due credit to Ewald, but is not willing to subscribe to all his theories.

In the third place, the general arrangement appears to us to be perspicuous and well-chosen. Indeed, in many respects, on this point, it does not differ materially from the common Hebrew Grammars. Not a few of the changes may be real improvements, yet in regard to a few, we cannot yet see our way clear. We must prefer, for instance, Gesenius's distribution of the nouns into about a dozen declensions. We would not pertinaciously retain exactly thirteen declensions. Why is it not better, however, to have a sufficient number of distinct declensions to embrace all the im-

portant differences in the nouns, rather than to confine them to four or six, and then be obliged to make four or five subdivisions under each of the four? Still, we are aware, that to many minds, the great number of declensions into which the nouns are distributed is in many grammars a stumbling block and a grievance. Such will, doubtless, be pleased with the arrangement of Mr. Nordheimer.

Again, a most important characteristic of the grammar before us is the endeavor to assign the reasons for the various forms and usages of the Hebrew language. The author appears to have brought to this subject a very philosophical and discriminating mind. No inconsiderable light has thus been shed on many intricate paths and dark corners. What, seemed to be mere accident or conventional usage is found to be in accordance with the nature of man and with sound philosophy. Still, we are not sure but that the author has pushed his efforts in this direction too far. Some persons, at least, may think that language is affected in a considerable degree by mere contingencies, or by fortuitous incidents which are incapable of explanation. However, the efforts of Mr. Nordheimer in this department are worthy of all praise. The Hebrew language is full of life and energy, and the grammarian and lexicographer should possess those views and feelings which will enable him to infuse a corresponding vitality and force into his researches.

We conclude this brief notice by expressing our cordial thanks to the author for this valuable addition to our helps in Hebrew study. May he reap a rich reward for his toils. The country of his adoption will welcome all such strangers as he, who comes to us richly freighted with that which is more precious than gold, yea, than fine gold.

8.—*The Life and Times of George Whitefield.* By Robert Philip, author of the *Experimental Guides*, etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1838. pp. 554.

Mr. Philip's works have been widely spread and have produced good fruits both in this country and in England. His style, however, has never been any great favorite of ours. It will do very well for a few pages. But we tire in reading a long book, or successive treatises. There is an affectation of point, terseness, striking terms, acute observations. Mr. Philip is, doubtless, far from supposing that there is any affectation in his manner. But what may seem to to himself to be natural, appears to us to be extremely unnatural. This characteristic comes out in the titles to some of his books. He attempts to entrap the reader by some strange combination of words, which on examination is specious and curious rather than weighty and judicious. The Preface to Whitefield's Life contains eighteen lines, of which the following are the last eight. "In regard to the *style* of this work I have nothing to say; except that it is

my *own* way of telling the facts of personal history. The time is not yet come for the *philosophy* of Whitefield's Life. It is, however, fast approaching; and, therefore, my mass of facts will soon be turned to good account by myself, or by some one. In the meantime, Whitefield will be *known* to the public; which he was not until now." The last sentence is not wholly correct. Whitefield has been known and justly known, for a long time, at least in the United States. Mr. Philip's book will deepen old impressions, rather than awaken any very important new ones. How the matter stands in England we do not know.

Still, we tender our acknowledgments to Mr. Philip for his work. Some new facts have been brought to light. Important contemporary biography and church history is introduced. The misrepresentations of Robert Southey are corrected. The balance is struck with much discrimination and fairness between Whitefield and Wesley and his brethren. The times in which Whitefield came upon the stage are correctly appreciated. Mr. Philip shows that he has a good acquaintance with this country, and is willing to judge fairly of its inhabitants. If he falls into error in respect to names and dates, if he does not always fully understand *our* congregationalism, our state of society, our modes of thinking and acting, we can readily pardon an Englishman and a stranger. These errors and misjudgments are, on the whole, remarkably few, and in general, unimportant.

The book will be read, and it deserves to be. Every candid reader will pardon the alliterations of the style for the sake of the matter, and for the sake of the subject; and *what* a subject! shining as the brightness of the firmament forever and forever—casting *many* crowns at Jesus' feet. The memory of Whitefield will never die on earth. It will gloriously flourish throughout "Heaven's eternal year."

9.—*Memoir of the Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy, who was murdered in defence of the Liberty of the Press, at Alton, Illinois, Nov. 7, 1837. By Joseph and Owen Lovejoy: with an Introduction, by John Quincy Adams.* New York: John S. Taylor.

It is but a few months since our minds were shocked by the report of the scenes of lawless violence at Alton. The community, high in its reputation for civil and social order, and even for christian philanthropy,—the victim, an accredited minister of the gospel, pursuing the work of an editor, with benevolent intentions, and, as he judged, in subordination to the laws of his country,—the assaults, deliberate, repeated, rising in violence and malignity, until at length, consummated in murder;—all these things conspire to render the catastrophe peculiarly mournful and ominous.

A considerable portion of our readers, we apprehend, have been accustomed to think of Mr. Lovejoy, as one of those turbulent and obstinate spirits, whose influence is really beneficial to society only as it is modified and changed by the over-ruling and corrective wisdom of God. If individuals of this class will take the trouble to read this Memoir, we doubt not they will rise from the perusal, with materially different impressions of his character as a whole. He possessed the *social sympathies* in a high degree. His feelings were warm, his attachments tender and enduring. As a son, a husband, a father, he stands before us in an interesting light. His *intellectual character* was of a higher order than we had supposed. Many readers will close this volume with raised conceptions of Lovejoy as possessing the inspirations of poetry, as well as the power of wielding with much effect, the compact vigor of pointed and manly prose. His *moral and religious character*, and in respect to sincerity and piety, were such as will not fail to command the respect of reasonable men. Whatever may have been his errors in judgment, he had great sincerity and strength of purpose, and was calmly inflexible in prosecuting what he conscientiously deemed the course of duty.

His brothers, the compilers of this memoir, though laboring under some disadvantages, have, in the main, performed their work with judgment and skill. The volume is interesting and instructive. It is the record of one whose life, though brief, had been eminently useful, as well as singularly eventful.

9.—*Journal of an Exploring Tour beyond the Rocky Mountains, under the direction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, performed in the years 1835, 1836, and 1837. Containing a description of the geography, geology, climate, and productions; the number, manners, and customs of the natives. With a map of Oregon Territory. By Rev. Samuel Parker. Ithaca, N. Y. 1838. pp. 371.*

Mr. Parker set out upon his journey March 14, 1835, from Ithaca, N. Y. On the 7th of April, with his companion, Dr. Marcus Whitman, he started from St. Louis, Mo., in connection with a caravan of the American Fur Company. On the 10th of August, he thus describes the passage through the Rocky mountains. "Cold winds were felt from the snow-topped mountains to an uncomfortable degree. The passage through these mountains is in a valley, so gradual in the ascent and descent, that I should not have known that we were passing them, had it not been that as we advanced, the atmosphere gradually became cooler, and at length we found the perpetual snows upon our right hand and upon our left, elevated many thousand feet above us—in some places, ten thousand. The highest part of these mountains are found by measurement to be

eighteen thousand feet above the level of the sea. This valley was not discovered till some years since. Mr. Hunt and his party, more than twenty years ago, went near it, but did not find it, though in search of some favorable passage. It varies in width from five to twenty miles ; and following its course, the distance through the mountains is about eighty miles, or four days' journey. Though there are some elevations and depressions in this valley, yet, comparatively speaking, it is level. There would be no difficulty in the way of constructing a rail road from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean ; and, probably, the time may not be very far distant, when trips will be made across the continent," etc. This is truly a remarkable discovery. If the facts should prove to be, as they appear from Mr. Parker's description, it is one of the most extraordinary provisions for the convenience of man ever made in the Providence of God in the solid frame-work of the globe. We could have wished that Mr. Parker had gone into full details and given us an exact account of the whole of this road excavated by the finger of God.

Mr. Parker pursued his journey among the mountains, stopping at various places, holding consultation with the Indians, and collecting various information, till he reached the mouth of the Columbia river. On the 28th of June, 1836, he embarked for the Sandwich Islands, and in sixteen days anchored in the roads of Honolulu. He reached New London, Ct. on the 18th of May, 1837.

A great variety of interesting information will be found in the volume. There is an air of honesty and entire trustworthiness about all the statements. But little, comparatively, is mentioned but what fell under the author's own observation. Mr. Parker seems to have had quite a tact for working his way among Indians, hunters, trappers, half-breeds and the heterogeneous multitude with whom he came in contact. Many of the Indians seem waiting for the gospel of Christ, and are ardently desiring teachers to be sent to them. The style of the volume is simple and unadorned. There is an occasional use of language which will be called *cant* by some persons. A part of it, as where the author speaks of his own religious feelings, might have been well spared. In one place, Mr. Parker makes use of *obliviscited* ; we know not in what vocabulary he found the term.

10.—*Home Education.* By the author of *Natural History of Enthusiasm*. London : Jackson & Walford, 1838. pp. 379.

So far as we have had opportunity to peruse this book, its views meet with our cordial approbation. The author does not appear as a profound reasoner, a curious speculatist, an investigator of christian antiquities, but as a practical man, explaining the principles by which he is guided in the education of his own children. Much of it is, however, in the author's peculiar and original manner. After some observations in regard to home economy in general, he introduces

the subject of a systematic culture of the mind, by suggesting some methods for eliciting, and for enriching, those faculties that are passive, and recipient chiefly, and which, as they are developed early, demand the teacher's attention before the time when any strenuous labors ought to be exacted from children. Mr. Taylor does not decide in favor of an exclusive system of Home Education. Great benefits attach to School Discipline, whether effected on a larger or smaller scale. Whatever may be said of female education, that of boys could not, in the majority of instances, be well conducted beneath the paternal roof. Still, the author thinks that home education, if the principles and methods proper to it are well understood, is both practicable and preferable in more instances than has been often supposed, and especially so for girls; and, also, that this system is susceptible of improvements, such as could not fail, if adopted to a considerable extent, very sensibly to promote the moral and intellectual advancement of the community.

The distinguishing recommendations of private intellectual education are 1. That the stress of the process may be made to rest upon sentiment and principle, and the deep reciprocal affections of the teacher and the taught, instead of its falling upon law, routine and mechanism. 2. That every thing, in method and matter, may be exactly adapted to the individual capacities and tastes of the learner, and the utmost advantage of culture secured for every special talent. 3. That it is, or may be, wholly exempt from the incumbrance and despotism of statutes, or of immemorial but irrational usages, or of prevalent notions, and may come altogether under the control of good sense, and is free to admit every good practice; and 4. That, while public education is necessarily a system of hastened development, private education is free to follow out the contrary principle of retarded development.

These and other considerations are urged in an effective and interesting manner. The whole, so far as we can judge, is a very enlightened, just and christian view of a most important subject.

12.—*M. T. Ciceronis ad Quintum Fratrem Dialogi Tres De Oratore. Ex editionibus Oliveti et Ernesti. Accedunt Notae Anglicae. Cura C. K. Dillaway. A. M. Bostoniae: Perkins et Marvin, 1838. Tom. I. 226. II. 229.*

We are glad to see that these unpretending and valuable labors of Mr. Dillaway are sufficiently appreciated by the public to permit him to proceed in his course. He has now in press one of the comedies of Terence. The series will probably combine a selection in three volumes from the works of Tacitus, one volume of Plautus, and the remaining works of Cicero in eight volumes. The successive volumes are printed with uncommon beauty and correctness. The notes are apposite and well adapted to the wants of the young student.

13.—*Memoir of Mrs. Sarah Louisa Taylor : or an Illustration of the Work of the Holy Spirit, in awakening, renewing, and sanctifying the heart. By Lot Jones, A. M., Missionary in the city of New York, in charge of the Mission Church of the Epiphany.* New York : John S. Taylor, 1838. pp. 324.

One of the reasons assigned by the author, for his having consented to compile this memoir, is "that he felt a deep interest in the subject, with a strong conviction, that, if suitably prepared, it could not fail to be useful." This conviction, we think, was well founded. It is an interesting and instructive exhibition of female character and piety ; and if associations with purity and truth are suited to improve both the heart and the life, the circulation of such memoirs as this will not fail to exert a salutary though silent influence on the public mind.

ARTICLE XII.

LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

United States.

Library of the New York Theological Seminary.

The Directors of the New York Theological Seminary, through the agency of Prof. Robinson and others, have recently purchased the Library of the Rev. Dr. Leander Van Ess of Bavaria in Germany, well known as the voluntary and successful agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society among the Roman Catholics of that country. This Library contains upwards of 13,000 volumes. Among which are most of the works of the *Greek and Latin Fathers, the London and Paris Polyglots, Ugolini's Thesaurus, Mauri's Concilia*, etc. etc. In the department of church history it is said to be quite full, and in all the departments, there are many works which are rare and of very high value. Dr. Van Ess has been forty years collecting this Library, and has now generously consented to dispose of it to an American Seminary for about one fifth part of its original cost to himself. The purchase is already made, and the books are probably now on their way to New York, where a commodious building is in the process of erection, and will be ready for the reception of the Library and for the other purposes of the Seminary early in the autumn. Such an accession to the stores of theological learning in our country is highly auspicious and creditable to the Institution which has thus early availed itself of its advantages.

We learn that Mr. Duponceau of Philadelphia has nearly ready for the press a learned work on language.—The Life of the Rev. Dr. Jonathan Mayhew of Boston, by Alden Bradford, LL. D. has just been published.—Rev. Dr. Humphrey, president of Amherst College, has published his Letters, originally inserted in the New York Observer, in two handsome duodecimo volumes. These Letters have acquired a deserved celebrity for sound sense, and discriminating remark. They are written in a lively and forcible manner. They show how an author, with Dr. Humphrey's strong powers of observation and of thinking, can go over a beaten track and not find it all barren.—Rev. Pres. Fisk's Travels in Europe have reached a fourth edition. We suppose that they have been widely circulated in the author's own denomination. We have not seen them.—Professor Conant's translation of Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar is proceeding through the press

France.

Baron De Sacy.

We have received the following tribute to the memory of M. De Sacy from an American gentleman who is devoting himself to Arabic literature, and who listened to the voice of De Sacy until it was closed in death. At a future day we may give our readers a more extended biography of this great scholar, with a list of his works.

"The illustrious savant Baron Sylvestre De Sacy died in Paris on the twenty-first of February, 1838, from the effects of a stroke of apoplexy, at the age of eighty years. The object of this brief notice is not to attempt to describe the peculiar features of mind and tone of sentiment which so distinguished him among his own countrymen, and have made his name so honored throughout Europe, but merely to pay to his memory a passing tribute of respect. He was born in the year 1758, and, while yet in early life, was engaged in the study of the oriental languages, being led to these pursuits by the inclination of his own taste. In the year 1795, when the school of modern oriental languages was established at the Royal Library in Paris, he was chosen to the chair of Arabic, and it was at this time that he first devoted himself to that department of literature over which he threw so much light and which he so adorned, during nearly half a century, to the day of his death.

"He was a most *diligent* scholar; his works are very numerous considering the profound subjects of which they treat, though they are but very little known in our country. It was so late 'even as the commencement of the present year that he published a treatise, in two octavo volumes, on the Religion of the Druses. Nor was he at all superficial, or a charlatan in his researches, as alas! too many of the French savans are,—he was *laborious*, *patient* and *accurate*. Probably no European has ever so thoroughly studied the works of the celebrated Arabic grammarians, or unravelled with such acuteness their many valuable suggestions on the principles of language

from the intricacies of their exceedingly fanciful mode of thought. He was distinguished, also, through life, for the purity of the motives which actuated his zeal. He did not strive with narrow selfishness after an imagined elevation in the eyes of his countrymen and of the world, but he labored from the love of learning and a desire to be useful in diffusing it. In the course of his long life honors accumulated upon him, yet he did not give himself up to self-complacent idleness, or to the feeling, too common in France, that as he ascended step by step higher in dignity, he was forbidden to touch foot again on his former lower fields of action. Thus, even on the day when the stroke which proved fatal fell upon him, this venerable man had been seated side by side with his pupils in Arabic, bearing as usual with all the vexatious inaccuracies which so finished a scholar could not but mark. He had also made his appearance in the cabinet of manuscripts at the Royal Library, to examine some Persian MSS. which the government was then proposing to purchase;—and he had filled his seat in the Chamber of Peers, and had spoken upon the subject then in debate.

“A word or two more may be hazarded in regard to his religious character. He was a devoted Jansenist, and was strenuously opposed to the awful innovations of that godless spirit of anarchy which has swept over France. It is to be hoped that all his high attainments were crowned by that pearl of great price, surpassing all the riches of the East.

“Most of the distinguished orientalists of Europe have listened to the instructions of Baron De Sacy, yet few are to be found, at present, in France, who walk in his steps. M. Garcen De Tassy, however, one of his former pupils and most favored friend, now professor of Hindostanee in the same school where he labored so long, seems to have imbibed much of the same spirit, and it is a pleasure to think that France may yet possess a savant to fill his place.”

Germany.

The following are some of the volumes which have recently been published in Germany—Ast's *Lexicon Platonicum sive vocum Platoniarum Index*, Vol. III. Fasciculus 2, *προγράφων—τίθιμι*. The conclusion of the last volume will be published in the beginning of the next year.—Suidae *Lexicon Graece et Latine ad fidem optimorum librorum exactam post Thomas Gaisfordum recensuit et annotatione critica instruxit G. Bernhardt*. Tom. I. Fasc. 4 et Tom. II. Fasc. 3. 4.—F. Nork has published an *Etymological Dictionary of the Latin language*.—The *Prophetical Spirit of the Hebrews* by Dr. A. Knobel, professor of Theology at Breslau.—Rückert's *Commentary on the second Epistle to the Corinthians*. That on the first Epistle was published in 1836.—Some of our readers will be glad to learn that the third section of Vol. IV. of Prof. Freytag's great Arabic Lexicon is published. The whole work will be finished in October next. The professor will publish a smaller work entitled “*Lexicon Arabico Latinum ex opere majore in*

usum tironum excerptum."—Professor Watke has published a Biblical Theology philosophically exhibited; Part I. exhibits the religion of the Old Testament according to the canonical books.

Armenia.

Professor Petermann of Berlin, has lately published a clear and succinct Grammar of the Armenian language.—C. F. Neumann has published at Leipsic an Essay towards a History of Armenian literature freely drawn from the works of the monks of the convent of Mechitar, at Venice. It will be a useful assistant in all researches in this interesting but neglected part of oriental literature. This literature deserves the attention of the learned from the circumstance that translations of Greek writers, the originals of which are lost, are still preserved in Armenia. The complete works of Philo Judaeus are said to be extant in an Armenian version, and would be published by learned natives, if sufficient encouragement were held out. Within the last twenty years an Armenian translation of the Chronicle of Eusebius, filling up many *lacunae* in the original, has been discovered. An edition of it in Armenian and Latin, and a Latin translation have appeared. The lamented Niebuhr made it the subject of a learned and elaborate memoir in his *Kleine Historische und Philogische Schriften*.

China.

Rev. John Dyer of Malacca has been, for some time, engaged in the preparation of moveable metallic type for printing the Chinese. M. Panthier is attempting to accomplish the same object in Paris.—In connection with the important effects of the medical practice of missionaries in China, we may state, that Sir Henry Hallford, president of the London college of Physicians, lately read a paper before that body strongly recommending the union of medical with theological knowledge in the preparatory studies missionaries.

ERRATA. Page 41, line 14 from bottom, for *evangelical* read *analogical*. P. 179, for Art. VII., read VIII.; and each succeeding No. read one No. in advance.

THE
AMERICAN
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

NO. XXXII.

OCTOBER, 1838.

ARTICLE I.

REMARKS ON VOLUNTARY AND ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF BENEVOLENT OBJECTS.

By Leonard Woods, D. D., Theological Seminary, Andover.

THE object of the following article is, to promote free, candid and fraternal discussion, and to do what can be done to bring Christians to agree in their modes of doing good, or, if they differ, to differ without strife, and in the exercise of brotherly kindness. How deplorable at this day, is the prevalence of party-spirit,—one mark of which is, that we see and acknowledge nothing wrong in the party to which we belong, and nothing right in the party opposed to us. For men of active benevolence and piety, to whatever denomination or party they belong, we ought to cherish a cordial affection and esteem. Towards any who love the Lord Jesus Christ, we cannot indulge ill-will or coldness, nor can we speak of them harshly or unkindly, *without sin*. God loves all his people; why should not we? God forgives their faults; why should not we? God commands us to do them good; why should not we obey?—Suppose good men differ from us; this is no reason why we should impugn their motives, or do any thing to injure their personal character, or to curtail their useful influence?

On the subject which I here introduce, I shall freely express my own thoughts and conclusions,—thoughts not hasty, but

sober and deliberate ; and conclusions, not rashly adopted, but resulting from long reflection, and long experience. And from the same reflection and experience, I derive a deep and growing conviction, that I am constantly liable to mistake, and that on subjects like the present, I ought specially to guard against undue confidence in my own opinions, and against all severe and uncandid reflections against those ministers of Christ who entertain other opinions. And if in what follows, a single unkind or disrespectful word shall be found, I will heartily condemn it, and wish it blotted out.—The attitude which I would take, is that of one who sincerely inquires, *what is the will of God*. Most cheerfully will I give the right hand of fellowship to all who are seeking the good of Zion, whatever modes of action they may adopt ; and I would say only this one thing to those who may judge differently from me as to the mode of doing good ;—*Dear Brethren, grant to me and those who think as I do, what we freely grant to you ;—permit us quietly to labor for the advancement of Christ's kingdom in the manner which we think to be the wisest and best, and most pleasing to God.*

I have not proposed to go into a particular examination of the arguments which have been urged on one side or the other of the subject here considered. The following article was written at the close of the last year ; and of course it had no reference to any thing which has since been published. My design was to suggest a few thoughts kindly, and with as much brevity as possible, for the consideration of men of intelligence and piety, who are desirous of doing good in the safest and most effectual manner.

There are some men of great excellence of character, who think that the objects of benevolence should be accomplished by the church of Christ, *as a divinely organized body* ; and that there are valid objections, against all attempts to do good on a large scale, except by *the church in its corporate state*.

I freely acknowledge that God has appointed the church to be the light of the world, the means of spreading the Gospel and saving the souls of men ; and that the members of the church ought to be united in this work. But when men speak of the church in reference to the subject under consideration, we cannot judge of the truth and propriety of their positions, without knowing exactly what meaning is to be affixed to the word. What then do you mean by *the church* ? Do you use the word

to signify *all the followers of Christ on earth, considered as one body*? The word sometimes has this sense. But I think you cannot use it in this sense here. For whatever you may say as to the *duty* of the whole body of Christians on earth to act together in a corporate or united state; the fact is, that no such state exists. They are not united and organized as one body, and of course are not in a capacity to act together *as one body*, to promote any benevolent object. So that if good is not done in some other way, it will not be done at all. For every one knows, that any attempt, in the present state of things, to bring all Christians on earth to act together in any work of benevolence would be abortive.

Do you then use the word *church* to signify a *collection or congregation of Christians in a particular place*? And when you say, that the work of benevolence should be undertaken by *the church* in its corporate state, as the only public association of men for benevolent purposes; do you mean that *each local church*, i. e. each congregation of Christians, should act *as a church*, in accomplishing the work of benevolence? According to this plan, every particular church would act by itself, without any visible connection with others, in disseminating the Scriptures and religious tracts, in raising up ministers, and in sending the Gospel to the heathen; that is, every single church would, to all intents and purposes, be a distinct Bible Society, a Tract Society, an Education Society, and a Missionary Society. And this would be the case with every single church belonging to every denomination of Christians. Each would exert its agency, and pursue its object in its own way, unconnected with others.—But this mode of operation would be attended with difficulties and embarrassments so manifest and so multiplied, that no one could be found to advocate it.

Will you then use the word *church* to denote *the whole body of Christians of one particular denomination, taken by itself*; the whole body of Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians and Methodists, living in this and other lands? And when you say *the church* must, in every case, undertake the work of benevolence; do you mean that each of these classes or denominations, including all its individual members in different parts of the world, taken collectively, must act together in undertaking the work, and that nothing must be done till they can be brought to exert a united agency? But who can be found that will advocate a mode of operation like this? An

attempt to bring all in different countries, who belong to either of these classes, to a visible, direct coöperation, would be a very unwise and hopeless attempt.

Shall then the word *church* denote *the collective body of Christians of each denomination, living in a particular country*? And when you say that the church, *as such*, must do any work of benevolence, is it your meaning, that all Congregationalists, and all Presbyterians and all Episcopalians in the United States, as distinct classes of Christians, must act together in such a work; and that nothing should be done, till all belonging to each particular class, at least a fair majority, shall be brought to unite? Few, I apprehend, would argue in favor of such a principle; and few good men, duly awake to the objects of benevolence, with whatever denomination they may be connected, would hesitate to act on another principle. It will be recollected that a majority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, for several years, refused to organize a Board of Foreign Missions; yet Synods, Presbyteries, and individuals of that denomination, who were in favor of such an organization, scrupled not to exert themselves in one way and another in favor of that truly christian object. Nor has any denomination of Christians doubted the propriety of acting in the same way. If only a part of any denomination,—say Congregationalists or Episcopalians,—are in favor of any great work of benevolence, shall that part neglect it? Shall those who are ready to act, lie still, because others are not ready? How has it been with different classes of Christians in Europe and America? What has been the commencement of action in the Bible cause, in the cause of Tracts, Sabbath schools, Foreign Missions and Temperance? And how has each been carried forward? Let us look at the history of benevolent undertakings, both here and abroad, and receive the instruction it affords.

But I must pursue the inquiry further. Will you then employ the word *church* to denote *a part of those who belong to a particular denomination*, as the Congregationalists in a particular State, the Presbyterians in a particular Synod, or the Episcopalians in a particular diocese? Suppose such a part of those belonging to a particular class of Christians, are of one heart in favor of some benevolent object. Can any one doubt the propriety of their uniting their endeavors, on any plan which they may prefer, to accomplish it? Now if this plan should go extensively into operation, there would be a distinct organiza-

tion, (in an ecclesiastical form, if you please,) of the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Episcopalians, etc., in Massachusetts, in Maine, in Connecticut etc., and of Presbyterians in other parts, for the whole range of benevolent purposes. Accordingly, the various benevolent enterprises of the day would be undertaken, not by *the church of Christ in Massachusetts or any other State, acting together as one body*, but by several distinct parts of it, each part acting independently of the others. Now if by *the church* you mean such a portion of one denomination of Christians, as live in one part of the country ; then these benevolent enterprises, thus conducted, might be said to be conducted by *the church*.

But while the mode of proceeding just described might in present circumstances, be proper ; there would be several difficulties not to be overlooked, respecting the manner of treating the subject.—It would be a manifest impropriety of language to call a small portion of the whole body of Christians, and a small portion of a single denomination of Christians, *the church of Christ* :—as manifest a solecism, as to call a single town or county, *the nation*, or a single nation, *the world*. And it is very questionable, whether the particular portion of Christians, and the particular portion of one denomination of Christians, above specified, can be called *a church*. *A church* may properly signify a particular society or congregation of Christians, united together for the worship of God in one place. But with what propriety can we call the general body of Congregationalists in Massachusetts, *a church* ? And with what propriety can we call the Presbyterians belonging to one Presbytery or Synod, *a church* ? In truth, the general body of Congregationalists in Massachusetts cannot be called either *a church* or *the church*. Nor can they be called *a Congregational church*, or *the Congregational church*. Nor can the Presbyterians, composing a Presbytery or Synod, be called either *a church* or *the church*,—or, *a Presbyterian church*, or *the Presbyterian church*. The same as to other denominations. *A Congregational, Presbyterian, or Episcopal church* is a body of Christians smaller than what is here intended ; while *the Congregational, Presbyterian, or Episcopal church* is larger.

Here one difficulty comes up after another. It is said, that *the Scriptures authorize only one public association of men for benevolent purposes, which is, the church of Christ ; that this is the only divine institution, and the only institution to be used*

for the spread of the Gospel, etc., and that any thing which is added to this, vitiates the church, and dishonors God. Now where do we find *this one public association of men, this one divine institution*, which is to accomplish every benevolent object? Is there any such thing on the face of the earth? I do not ask, whether there *should* be a body of men answering to this description; but whether there *is* such a body. If it exists, where is it found? Where, in any part of the world, or in all parts together, can you fix your eye upon *one public association of men for benevolent purposes,—one and only one divine institution*, which is adequate to accomplish every good object? If all the followers of Christ were united and organized into one great, harmonious body, that body surely could be found. But, it does not exist. And if benevolent objects are not to be accomplished, except by this *one public association of men*, they are not to be accomplished at all.

Is then *that one divine institution, that one public association of men* found in each of the different denominations of evangelical Christians? Does *the one and the only divine institution* show itself in the Congregational, the Presbyterian, the Baptist, the Episcopal denomination, etc.? If by *that one public association* is meant, what would seem to be meant by *it, the organization of God's people on earth into one visible body* for the accomplishment of his benevolent designs; then, as I have before said, there is no such thing in existence. The followers of Christ are divided into a great number of parties, each party organized in a manner different from others, and for the most part acting separately from others, and not unfrequently in opposition to others. Now is this dividing of the Christian world into parties, or sects, in accordance with the will of God? Is it *the divine institution*, that there should be, as there actually is, a multitude of distinct and separate public associations of Christians, formed on different principles, bearing different names, having no visible connection with each other, and often acting against each other? Is all this according to the word of God? Far from it. Every sober man must acknowledge that the existence of these various and clashing sects is a wide departure from the precepts and the spirit of Christianity; that these different and separate associations and denominations of Christians are institutions devised by man's wisdom, and established by his authority, in opposition to the authority of God. And yet there is no other church of Christ on earth, but what is made up of

these different denominations. What now shall be done? Shall the attempt be made to bring all Christians to unite in one body, one public association; and shall the attempt be continued till such a visible union is effected? And shall we adopt the principle, that no great work of love is to be undertaken, till Christians are thus united, and so fitted to act harmoniously in accomplishing the objects of benevolence? Christians at large have certainly, by their divisions, deviated from the standard of holy writ, and have thereby involved themselves and the cause of their Master, in great difficulty. In all this they are verily guilty before God. But because they have sinned in this matter, shall they sin in every thing else? Because they have left undone the duty of maintaining a complete unity among themselves, shall they leave all other duties undone? Because they have disobeyed those divine precepts which require them all to be one, and which respect them in their associate capacity as constituting the kingdom of Christ; shall they also disobey those precepts which respect them in their *individual capacity*, and require them to relieve the distressed, to instruct the ignorant, to labor for the spread of the Gospel and the conversion of sinners, and to do good to all men? And if a smaller or larger number of individual Christians find that they can unite together in accomplishing any labor of love to which they are called by the word of God, and are satisfied that such union will aid their efforts and contribute to their success; what shall hinder them from uniting? And may not the union and united action of those who are prepared for it, be among *the most effectual means of bringing about a larger union*, and of hastening the time when Christians every where shall unite and act together?

But it may be said, such a union of individual Christians, as that just mentioned, instead of being a divine institution, is altogether of *man's devising*; and consequently it cannot be a fit and lawful means of spreading the gospel, and doing good in other ways. But is such a union of individual Christians for benevolent purposes any more a matter of man's devising, than the union of individual Christians in a distinct and separate denomination? And is it any farther from being a divine institution? Why then should it be regarded as less fit for the accomplishment of the objects of benevolence? I know it may be said, that God authorizes Christians to form themselves into *an ecclesiastical body, a church state*, and in that state, to labor

for the conversion of sinners and the enlargement of Christ's kingdom. But does God authorize Christians to form themselves into *such* ecclesiastical bodies as now exist, i. e. distinct and separate ecclesiastical sects or denominations? Does not the Apostle Paul earnestly protest against it? (See 1 Cor. 3: 1—4, and many other places,) and is not the existence of such sects a standing subject of lamentation with all enlightened Christians? Much is said against the associations of benevolent individuals for benevolent purposes, because they are formed *voluntarily*, in contradistinction to what is expressly of divine appointment. But are these benevolent associations *more voluntary*, and more in contradistinction to what is *expressly* of *divine appointment*, than the combining of Christians into separate sects in an ecclesiastical form?

What then is to be done? Let me ask, what *is* done, even by those who contend that every thing should be done by that one association of men, which the word of God expressly authorizes, and by no other? Why, each separate sect or denomination, though existing in that separate state in direct opposition to the divine institution, goes on and acts, *as a distinct and separate and voluntary association*, in accomplishing every great and good object, and seems not to doubt that all is right. Yes, even those, who maintain that every thing should be done by *that one public association of men* which the Bible authorizes, act in this way, i. e. by uniting together as *a distinct denomination*, separate from the great body of good men who constitute the real church of Christ, (a proceeding far from being authorized by the Bible;) or, when they cannot bring their whole denomination to unite, they bring a *part* of it to unite; and with that part, even if it be a small part, they undertake the business of christian benevolence. I do not mention this to object to it. But it is manifestly in direct opposition to the principle, that nothing should be done, except by the *one divinely authorized public association of men*, the church of Christ. For plainly, those members of the denomination who are prepared to act together, are not *the church of Christ*. Nor is the whole denomination *the church of Christ*. If you say, they are *a part* of the church;—so are any individual Christians who choose to unite together in doing good.

To maintain that an ecclesiastical organization is the only one which can properly prosecute the work of benevolence on a

large scale, would be attended with *special* difficulty among the Congregationalists in Massachusetts, and in other parts of New England. For, except particular churches, and a few Consociations, we have no permanent ecclesiastical organization. And this want of ecclesiastical organization makes it impracticable for us to do any thing on a large scale, in an *ecclesiastical* way. For example : The Congregationalists in Massachusetts cannot engage in the missionary work *ecclesiastically*, unless the members of all the churches meet in one great assembly and act together in sending forth missionaries, or appoint representatives to act in their stead. The first cannot be thought of. As to the second method, how important soever we may consider an ecclesiastical body, representing the Congregationalists in Massachusetts ; yet we have none. The Convention of Congregational ministers, the Pastoral Association, the General Association, and the several district Associations, are all *clerical* bodies, having no delegates from the churches, and not being themselves representatives of the churches. The General Association is indeed a representative body ; but it is merely *clerical*, and is made up of delegates from other clerical bodies. Now suppose we were, at this time, to begin the work of Foreign Missions, as we did a quarter of a century ago. Should we call all the churches to come together in one great body ? Or should we invite them to send delegates to form a Foreign Missionary Society ? But what if they should refuse ? Besides on the principle under consideration, *who would have a right to send forth such a call, unless previously authorized by the churches ?* And if any individuals should venture to do it, might they not be charged with an unwarrantable assumption of ecclesiastical power ? Should then the *General Association* undertake the work ? But the General Association is not *the church*, nor is it a body which represents the church ? It is not an *ecclesiastical*, but a *clerical* body. And if it should do any thing in the name of the churches, or any thing involving the churches in any obligation ; would it not be regarded as clerical usurpation ? Would there, then, be no way to begin the work of Foreign Missions ? Might not the members of the General Association, or any other ministers or Christians, in compliance with the commands of God, engage in the business *themselves, as individuals* ? And might they not propose it to others to join with them ? Doubtless they might. The members of the General Association in 1810 actually did this, as a clerical body,

without claiming any ecclesiastical power. But they had confidence in the churches, on whom the success of their undertaking depended, and trusted that through the mercy of God, so good a cause would be patronized. Nor did they trust in vain. That beginning of the missionary work has been a plant, which though small at first, has grown up and become a great tree, the leaves whereof are for the healing of the nations.

Is it said, that those who commenced that important work, should have postponed it till they had brought the churches to a readiness to engage in it? But this might have required long continued efforts on the part of those who were disposed to be active in the work. And then, upon the principle of the objector, how could they with propriety have made these efforts, without having been in any way authorized by the churches? And if they had themselves delayed all action in the cause of missions till they had persuaded the churches to unite in the work, they might, on this very account have failed of persuading them. For in all probability, *the only successful appeal to the churches depended on the actual and vigorous prosecution of the work of missions, for a time, by those who were its hearty and active friends, and on the evidence derived from acknowledged facts, that it might be prosecuted with success.*

If you ask, to whom a missionary, or other voluntary society, formed in the usual way, are responsible? I ask, to whom is an Association, or Consociation, or Presbytery, or Synod responsible? Either of these bodies, undertaking the cause of missions alone, acts on its own responsibility, except that it is responsible to the Christian public, and especially to God. But you say, the Association, Consociation, Presbytery or Synod intrust the missionary business to a Board of Directors, and that this Board are responsible to the body which appoints them? The same is true in the other case. A missionary society intrust the business of missions to a Board or Committee; and this Board or Committee are responsible to the Society. There is an equal responsibility in both cases, and created in the same way. And why are not the interests of the Society equally safe, if *the men who constitute the body, acting as a missionary society, and the men who are appointed as directors, are equally numerous and equally intelligent, pious and faithful?* The circumstance of their acting as members of a clerical or an ecclesiastical body, cannot give security to the missionary interest committed to them, unless they are intelligent, trustworthy and faithful in their individual capacity.

In view of the foregoing remarks, I cannot but think, that those who affirm, *that benevolent works should be undertaken by the church of Christ, and by that only, in an exact ecclesiastical form*, will find the position difficult, embarrassing, and untenable.

Christians are united together in the form of a church, or in the form of churches, for very obvious and important purposes ; and this church form is evidently adapted to accomplish these purposes. And why may not Christians be united in other forms for other important purposes ? And why may not other forms of union be best adapted to accomplish these other purposes ? Is it not so in our civil state ? Our being united together as Towns, Counties, States, and a nation, is manifestly suited to various important purposes ; but not to *all* purposes. For weighty reasons we judge it best to form other associations for literary, charitable, agricultural, mercantile, and moral objects. An attempt to accomplish all these by acting as Towns, Counties, etc. would embarrass and shackle all our movements, and end in disappointment.

It may be said, that, if Towns, Counties, States, and the nation were what they should be and acted as they ought, in the capacity of civil corporations, they would be competent to do all that could be done in promoting every good object. Now, although this is not perfectly evident, I will admit it. But these civil bodies are *not* what they should be. And the question is, can every important design be carried into effect by their agency, *they being what they are* ? Is there no occasion for other Associations ? And may not other Associations be better adapted, than those above mentioned, to various important objects ? And if the laws of the land should prohibit all other Associations of men, and require that every thing should be done by these civil bodies, would it not cramp the active spirit of the community, and hinder their useful exertions ? Is it not generally by the genius and enterprise of *individuals*, sometimes acting by themselves, but more commonly forming themselves into smaller or larger associations, that the community at large is advanced in the useful arts and sciences, and in all social and civil advantages ? And why may not the same hold in respect to the objects of Christian benevolence ? *Church* organization is a divine institution, and is suited to various and momentous purposes. And say, if you please, that

if the church at large were what it should be, it is suited, in its appropriate organization as a church, to ALL important purposes. But the church is so far from what it should be,—it is so divided into sects and parties, in which there is so little holiness and so much sin, that it is by no means suited, in its present state, to the various objects of benevolence. You cannot bring the whole church on earth to act together as one organized body, in disseminating the Bible, or in sending the Gospel to the heathen. And you may not be able at once to bring all who belong to a particular denomination, or any considerable part of them, to act together in such a work, in an ecclesiastical way. Will you therefore do nothing? If you have a little company of fifty or a hundred, who are of the same mind with you; will you lie still because others are of a different mind? Will you extinguish the benevolence and zeal which God has kindled up in your breast, and deprive the world of the benefit of its influence, and hinder the accomplishment of that great work of love, which may be accomplished, if you, with a few others, will resolutely commence it, and move others by your example?

As to the Congregationalists in Massachusetts and other parts of New England, to whom I have already referred,—if they act at all, they must act in a way correspondent with their condition. But you may say, they should forthwith change their condition, and put themselves into an ecclesiastical state, suited to the great objects of benevolence which are now presented before them? Suppose then this change to be desirable, and suppose it to be practicable too, in consistency with Congregational principles; as would appear from the ecclesiastical state of Connecticut. Still while Congregationalists in Massachusetts retain their present opinions, as they have a right to do, on the subject of church government, the proposed change cannot take place. Must we then abstain from all efforts to evangelize the heathen? And if our present ecclesiastical state is to remain for generations to come, must we, through all those generations, still do nothing for the conversion of the heathen? Because we are not prepared to act in the way which you think to be the best, shall we not act at all? And, to go where they have a settled ecclesiastical organization; because the clergy and people of the church of England are not disposed, *as a church*, to engage in the missionary work; shall

those who are disposed, do nothing? If men of a missionary spirit belonging to the church of England, and those belonging to the church of Scotland, and if men of such a spirit among the Dissenters in Great Britain, and in New England, had acted on this principle, where would have been all those benevolent institutions which have been originated there and here, and which have not only been successful in accomplishing the object directly aimed at, but have awakened the spirit of Christian compassion and love in the minds of multitudes who stood aloof, and induced them to enlist heartily in the same work? From the beginning of these benevolent operations, it has been constantly affirmed and demonstrated to be the duty of the whole Christian church, and of all particular, local churches, and of all denominations and classes of Christians, to send the Gospel to the heathen. But nominal Christians generally have been lamentably remiss in regard to this duty; and there has been only a comparatively small number in different parts of Christendom who have cordially given themselves to the work. This small number of faithful ministers and Christians have not been able to do what they would; but they have done what they could. They would have rejoiced to see all Christians on earth, of all denominations united in this work, and laboring as subjects of the same glorious Lord and King, to extend his peaceful reign over the whole world. But as this could not be, they had no alternative left, but to abandon the work altogether, or to bring as many as they found like-minded, to shake off their slumbers, and in good earnest to join with them in beginning this long-neglected work. Thanks to God that they determined upon this course; and with what wisdom, zeal and success they have pursued it, the world knows.

Now let it be remembered, that the Congregationalists could not, to this day, have done any thing, *as an ecclesiastical body*; for they have not been formed in such a body. And we know too that the majority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church have not till recently undertaken the work of Foreign Missions; and probably would not have done it now, had not smaller portions of that church commenced it before. And even now, the church of England at large is very far from being prepared to engage in the missionary enterprise.

I must therefore proceed to say, that it is evidently expedient, and of great importance, to *leave the door open for different modes of action in promoting the objects of benevolence*. To

maintain, that every thing which is to be done for reforming and saving the world, must be done in one and the same way ; and to regard whatever is done in any other way, with dissatisfaction or indifference, would in my view betray a very narrow way of thinking, and a disposition to oppose the manifest leadings of divine providence. The great Apostle showed himself to be of a very different mind from this, when, looking at the preaching of Christ by men of different characters, and some of them very unfriendly to himself, he expressed the feelings of his heart in these remarkable words: "Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached ; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and I will rejoice." Noble spirit ! worthy to be imitated by all who preach the same gospel, and serve the same divine Master ! To attempt to bring Christians of every denomination, and in all circumstances, to think and act in the same way in regard to the objects of benevolence, would be as fruitless, as to attempt to bring them all to think alike respecting church government, and the outward forms of worship. The state of Christendom is far from what it should be ; and many evils exist which cannot at present be remedied. Let us employ our talents upon objects which are of the greatest importance, and which we may have some prospect of accomplishing. Let us do all the good we can in present circumstances. And as we cannot induce all Christians to do good in the way which we prefer, let us be willing they should do good in their own way. And though we may imagine that more good would be done, if they should all adopt our way ; still let us rejoice that they do a less degree of good, rather than none. We may think it best that all efforts in the cause of benevolence should be made by an ecclesiastical organization ; or we may think they should be made by voluntary associations. But whether we prefer the one, or the other, many Christians will differ from us, and will act, if they act at all, in another way. Why should we oppose them ? Why be disquieted, provided they allow us the same liberty which they ask for themselves ? Why not say in the spirit of the Apostle : *Notwithstanding, every way, whether by an ecclesiastical or a voluntary organization, the glad tidings are proclaimed to the perishing ; and we therein do rejoice, yea, and we will rejoice.* We cannot govern the world. We cannot control the judgments and wills of our fellow Christians. And God has not called us to do it. Let us give it up, and that cheerfully

and kindly. Far away from us be all contracted views, all jealousy, envy, unholy emulation, and party-spirit. Let us look with candor and forbearance, and with sincere, expansive benevolence, upon all who differ from us. Let our desire for the conversion of the heathen and the increase of the church be so strong, that we shall heartily rejoice in it, whether accomplished by our own labors, or the labors of others. When those of one denomination make report of the good which, through the blessing of God, they have accomplished; *let them, with equal gratitude, mention the good which other denominations have accomplished.* When those who prefer *voluntary* movements, make report of their success; *let them be sure to notice also the success of those who prefer to act in an ecclesiastical way.* And let those who prefer this way, *never forget to notice what is done by those who prefer the other way.* Oh! it is enough to make our hearts swell with joy, to think of the full exercise of this spirit of mutual candor, and mutual justice, and hearty good-will, among the different classes of Christians! This excellent spirit has begun to show itself in our country. May its happy influence pervade all our hearts, and all our public and private transactions. If we would conform to the precepts of our religion—if we would prevent bitterness and strife and envy and evil speaking—if we would shine as lights in the world, and be successful in promoting the welfare of Christ's kingdom; let us cherish this candid, impartial, kind, generous disposition, and endeavor to diffuse it among our fellow Christians. And if the case requires, let some portion of the zeal, which we have laid out in opposing those good men who differ from us, be henceforth laid out in correcting our own faults, and in cultivating this benevolent, Christlike spirit towards the followers of Christ of every name and every party.

To those who are advocates for one mode of doing good in preference to other modes, let me say;—Brethren, why should there be any strife? Ought we not to grant to others the same rights, as we claim for ourselves,—the rights of conscience, and free agency? We may think it strange that our arguments do not convince our brethren; and they may think it equally strange, that their arguments do not convince us. Perhaps we may charge them with prejudice. And is it not possible that we may be chargeable with the same? Are we not liable to

some improper bias? Have we never erred in judgment? And may we not hereafter discover some error in our present views?

There are not a few men of sincere benevolence and integrity, who are afraid to admit the principle of Voluntary Associations, because indiscreet, extravagant, or ambitious men have made use of it to sanction disorderly and pernicious measures. The principle, I allow, may be abused, and be made the occasion of great evil. And so may the principle of ecclesiastical organization. If the argument is valid against one, it is so against the other. Let all the error, superstition, despotism, persecution, and cruelty, which have been found in ecclesiastical bodies, and have been promoted and acted out by them, and by their authorized ministers, be fairly set forth; and would not the amount of the evil be fearfully great? Would it not far exceed that which has resulted from Voluntary Associations? What then? Is the abuse or perversion of a thing any argument against the thing itself? By no means. It is indeed true, that the experience we have had of the evils resulting from the abuse of any just and important principle, should excite us to exercise all possible diligence and care in order to guard against such abuse in future; but it is no reason for abandoning the principle itself. As to the subject now before us; instead of setting ourselves in opposition to the principle of Voluntary Associations,—a principle which is in itself blameless, and which has been productive of immense good, and is, in some circumstances, indispensable to the welfare of the church;—instead of setting ourselves in opposition to this principle, let us employ all the wisdom we have acquired to give it a right direction, and to prevent its being turned to a bad use by heated, reckless, or unprincipled men. This is our proper business at the present day. And in this important business it is hoped that ministers and Christians will act with more and more union and zeal. A little more of this union and zeal, added to a disposition to profit by experience, and the great end is secured,—the order of the church and the interests of pure religion are safe, without breaking in upon a principle, which has been and still may be productive of so much good.

But here one caution is required. We have seen and deplored the abuse of the “Voluntary Principle,” in some instances, and the disorder and desolation which have followed in its train. In consequence of this, are we not in danger of disre-

garding the immeasurable benefits which the principle has produced? The good which has been accomplished by Voluntary Societies in the various departments of Christian benevolence, ought to be remembered with the most devout gratitude. The events which have given distinction and glory to the last fifty years, and for which continual thanks are offered up to God, by innumerable multitudes in the four quarters of the globe—these blessed events have, for the most part, been brought about by the agency of Voluntary Societies. Now would it not betray an unbecoming state of mind in us, if we should be so absorbed with the contemplation of the evils which, in some instances, have been occasioned by the perversion of the Voluntary Principle, as to lose sight of the great amount of good which has been effected by its legitimate action? Better err on the other side;—better be so absorbed with the contemplation of the immeasurable good, as to lose sight of the evil which has come in. But it is best of all to avoid error on both sides;—on one side to notice the whole extent of good, and duly to estimate its value; and on the other side, to keep a watchful eye upon the evils which have stolen in upon us through the folly or rashness of men, and to adopt the most wise and energetic measures to remove them, and to shut the door against their occurrence in future. But at the present day are there not faults apparent on both sides? Do we not find men who celebrate the happy results of Voluntary Societies, with incessant raptures,—who speak of them as though they were in no case mingled with any portion of evil, and who seem to see nothing but unqualified and unbounded good? On the other hand, do we not find those, who keep so vigilant and jealous an eye upon the evils resulting from the occasional perversion of what is in itself right, and who are so alarmed at the appearance of danger, that they do really lose sight of the vast amount of good which has been done; or, if they see it at all, see it as though they saw it not? Unquestionably, there is something true and something false, something useful and something hurtful on both sides. Happy they, who hold fast what is true and useful, and rid themselves of what is false and hurtful.

Finally: *Let none who love the cause of Christ, be in haste to innovate upon the common methods of benevolent action.* I urge it as a reason for this caution, that the evils of sudden innovation, even when the change proposed is in itself important, frequently prove more than an overbalance for all the benefits

resulting from it. Various benevolent institutions in New England and in other parts of the country,—our Missionary Societies, Domestic and Foreign, our Bible, Tract, Education and Temperance Societies, and our Associations for establishing and supporting Literary and Theological Seminaries, have been in successful operation for a considerable length of time. Now to new-model these institutions, so as to bring them directly under the control of the church at large, or of any particular ecclesiastical bodies, would be a work of a very serious nature, and of very difficult accomplishment. And certainly, such a work should not be entered upon in haste. In these great concerns, it is of the highest moment that rash and perilous attempts at innovation should be avoided. Even if our various institutions, in their present state, are liable to some exceptions, and if the love of preëminence, or party spirit, or indiscreet zeal may take occasion from them to introduce pernicious irregularities; still there is urgent reason to be cautious, and to guard watchfully against the mischiefs that would be likely to result from *sudden changes*. This all sober men acknowledge to be of vast consequence in regard to *civil* institutions. And why is it not of equal consequence in regard to charitable institutions, especially those which have been long established and extensively patronized, and which, by the wisdom of their measures, and by the success which has attended them, have secured the confidence of the public? If the Episcopalians, and Presbyterians, and Methodists in our country, who have a settled ecclesiastical organization, are in whole or in part, disposed to carry on their benevolent operations in an ecclesiastical form; we will be so far from throwing any obstacles in their way, that we will most gladly do all in our power to contribute to their success by our good wishes and by every act of fraternal kindness, only asking that they would not interfere with the liberty of others. But before attempting any material changes in those benevolent institutions which have been established on the Voluntary Principle, and have been long in successful operation, it should well be ascertained, *that there are important evils which attend our benevolent institutions, or result from them, in their present form, and that these evils are the genuine fruit of what is peculiar in the present scheme of action*. It should also be ascertained, *that neither these evils, nor others of equal magnitude, would be likely to result from the other scheme, which is proposed to come in place of the present*. If, after careful and

patient and repeated consideration, it shall be found expedient that an important change should take place in the plan of our benevolent societies—a change which will bring them directly under the supervision of ecclesiastical bodies ; let the change be attempted with such kindness and gentleness, and be carried into effect with such moderation and judgment, that no rupture or collision shall take place among brethren, and no wound inflicted on the feelings of the Christian community, and what is of paramount importance, that no check be given to benevolent feeling and benevolent action, and no obstacle cast in the way of the conversion of the world. If there are sufficient reasons for changes in our mode of doing good ; intelligent and pious men can certainly understand those reasons, and in due time, be prepared unitedly to adopt any changes which promise to advance the welfare of the church. And be it remembered, as a principle of primary consequence, though at the present time, most grievously neglected, that *men of sense will be much sooner convinced by sober and weighty arguments, than by empty declamation and sophistry, and more easily persuaded by kindness and gentleness, than by wrath and violence.* If we apprehend, (I speak in the name of those who have such an apprehension,) —if we apprehend that serious evils will result from the present plan of operation, and that valuable improvements may be made ; let us with great sincerity and frankness, but with modesty, communicate our views to others, and let the matter be well considered and weighed ; and let no attempt be made to introduce a change, before the way is prepared for it. And it will not unfrequently be found that, even after the subject has been some time before the public, the safest, and most effectual way, yea, the only way, to bring about an important change is, to introduce it by parts, a little now, and a little more by and by ; as the British Parliament have done. This tends to prevent alarm and the burst of excited passion, diminishes the force of opposition, and begets quietness and confidence. It is especially important, not only as a matter of practical wisdom, but as a Christian duty, to keep at a great distance from all bitter or harsh reflections upon those who are not convinced by our arguments and who adhere strongly to the plan of action to which they have been used. Invincible reluctance to change, is not among the worst things in human nature. Nay, it often results from the most praise-worthy principle. And though we may think

it exists in a very faulty degree, and though it may occasion us trouble, and may stand in the way of the accomplishment of our favorite objects; we should still treat it with the utmost forbearance and lenity. And if, after all our appeals to reason, benevolence, and piety, we are not so happy as to find, that the time has come, when the proposed changes can be peaceably and harmoniously effected; then, instead of giving way to fretfulness or sourness of temper, let us cherish feelings of perfect good-nature. And as others may not be so pliable as we wish, and may not bend to the new plan of benevolent action, which we should prefer, let us learn to be pliable ourselves, and quietly go along with them a while longer, in the old way, thus avoiding the evils of division and strife, and keeping the unity of spirit in the bond of peace.

ARTICLE II.

AUTHORITY, A SOURCE OF MORAL OBLIGATION.

By Rev. L. P. Hickok, Prof. of Didactic Theology, Western Reserve College, Ohio.

A PREVAILING spirit of insubordination to law fearfully characterizes the present day. It is evinced in the thousand individual cases where inclination, ambition and interest trample upon authority—in the frequent appeals to a false code of honor—in the frenzy and corruption of contested elections—in the violent assumption of law by reckless men into their own hands, and wreaking private hate by a tumultuous and summary vengeance—and in the excited commotions of a collected and frantic populace, rushing like a tempest over all law to its object amid scenes of riot, conflagration and blood. Yea, in addition to the licentiousness openly advocated by some shameless lecturers both male and female, there are not wanting instances where the influence of a christian name and profession is directly applied to the dissemination of principles which sap the foundations of all authority, and prostrate the salutary restraints of civil legislation. All witness the prevalence of this disorganizing spirit, and all the wise and good deplore it.

Perhaps this result was to have been expected from the pro-

gress of free principles, and the operation of a free government. It is human nature to take extremes, and thus it might have been anticipated that many minds, when loosed from the point of passive obedience, would swing over to the opposite point of licentious indulgence. But if from the nature of man such an anticipation were rational, it by no means diminishes the danger from the fact itself. There can be no safety in leaving this spirit to its unhindered action, and permitting it to move on to its certain issue, with no vigorous efforts in counteraction. The Repository, it is true, is not the proper medium for reaching the great mass of disorganizers and levelers, still in the higher and purer atmosphere where it moves, it is not to be presumed that there are none, who, if they do not directly throw all their influence against the majesty and authority of law, are yet entirely prevented, and from confused or perverted views absolutely disqualified, from standing out its firm supporters and defenders. A thorough, honest and serious discussion of the subject in these pages can hardly fail to subserve the interests of patriotism, philanthropy and religion. The present Article is designed as a small contribution to this object.

Conscience may be reached, and a sense of obligation awakened from two sources,—*the nature of things*, and, *authority*. The *first* is by a direct intuition of right, or a reflective perception of expediency, in things themselves—the *second* is by the legislation of a sovereign enactment. One has the approbation or remorse of natural conscience for its sanctions, the other has the additional retributions of positive rewards and punishments. Both have a direct appeal to the ultimate principle of right—the *first*, to the rightness of the precepts—the *second*, to the rightness of the authority. Both lay inviolate obligations upon conscience, but from two distinct sources. One insisting, thus saith *nature*—the other, thus saith *law*. One inquires, How *reasonest* thou?—the other, How *readest* thou?

The present design includes the latter only, and accordingly we will consider to some extent *the nature of authority as a source of human obligation*.

Two inquiries will cover the ground we propose to occupy, viz.

- I. *Why is authority necessary as a source of obligation?*
- II. *What is the test of legitimate authority?*

The *necessity of authority* in the direction of human conduct is the main point of controversy. It is strenuously denied that

there is any necessity for it in the government of man. Law has no claims to obedience for its own sake. Man is fully competent from his own reason for all the purposes of self-government as a member of civil society, and thus all authority is at the best superfluous. If it require what the man does not approve, it is tyranny ; if it require only what he does approve, it is useless. All that man needs is instruction, not authority ; he must be convinced, not commanded.

From this general assumption originate a variety of differently modified theories. One affirms that pleasure or happiness is the only good, and this is found in the gratification of his constitutional susceptibilities, and thus while it is right to follow natural appetite, this too is a sufficient directory. Gratify it when it craves, and stop when it is satiated. Another, on the same principle that pleasure is the only good, admits that a wakeful discretion is necessary, lest its possession be more than counterbalanced by subsequent suffering. But it is earnestly asserted that every man's own faculties are abundantly competent to make the estimate and guide the conduct. Another would so cultivate the social sympathies and natural sensibilities that they shall preserve the order and peace of society. Another assumes that a proper appeal to man's natural sense of justice and reciprocal rights, and especially to the feelings of kindness and benevolence are sufficient for all the purposes of social regulation without any positive enactments—and still another, more elevated in its conception and plausible in its argumentation, asserts that man is endowed with reason which cannot but be in conformity with universal truth, and all right legislation therefore must be in harmony with it. Obedience to all law will thus exactly coincide with the dictates of pure reason in each individual, and render him the most free when he is the most obedient.

All these, however, from the more refined and elevated system of Jean Jacques Rousseau's social contract, down to the gross and insane schemes of Robert Dale Owen and Frances Wright Darismont, involve as fundamental, the principle that man is singly competent to all the purposes of self-government as a member of civil society, and that he needs nothing and should yield obedience to nothing but the law of his own nature within him. All authority in accordance with this law of nature is superfluous, and all that transcends it partakes of the very essence of tyranny, and is to be unconquerably resisted. Man

has the right to judge all law and hold himself absolved from allegiance to all authority which does not square with his unerring convictions. All authority is thus completely and forever nullified, for when the precept is obeyed it is never to be because it was commanded, but simply because it was seen to be rational. It is not authority which is to fasten obligation upon the conscience, but the perceived conformity to the nature of things.

It cannot be denied that many theories which lead to the above conclusion are made to assume a very plausible appearance, and are supported by very specious arguments. No theory can gain footing in the world and embody among its advocates a large number of confessedly learned and ingenious minds, without involving much truth, and this so skilfully inwrought that it may hold the system together for a time in spite of the dangerous and perhaps fatal errors which are included within it. This is peculiarly true with the subject before us. It is a principle fundamental to all moral freedom and responsibility, which we are to yield only with life, *that nothing shall be allowed to intermeddle with conscience*. Its rights are sacred, and no authority from heaven or earth can release from its hallowed obligations. Nothing can bind to obedience in opposition to the clear perception of intuitive right. These immutable truths are applied in various forms to the foregoing schemes, and the efforts to sunder the bonds of all authority is made, by a perversion of the most stable principles in moral science. And truly if the claims of positive law cannot be sustained without subverting the rights of conscience, if the obligations of authority cannot be upheld but at such a sacrifice, then let every sceptre fall and every throne crumble. Sooner shall heaven and earth pass away, than one jot or tittle of this law, written upon every man's bosom by God's own finger, shall be erased. But no such sacrifice is demanded. The majesty and authority of law stands firm in perfect harmony with these immutable principles. **ALL TRUTH IS ONE**, and all its parts in everlasting consistency. A comprehensive view of the subject before us will most surely disclose that the same principles which have been used to nullify all authority as lording it over conscience, demand unqualified submission to legitimate authority as the rightful lord and sovereign of conscience. It is here emphatically true, that

"Shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
But drinking largely sobers us again."

Two general considerations will suffice to prove the necessity of authority as a source of moral obligation.

1. *There are many purposes essential to the government of society, which cannot be gained by leaving mankind to the separate decisions of each one's intuitive or reflective perception.*

In some things, right is seen by *intuition*, and obligation at once felt. In other things, duty is found only by a patient examination of circumstances and comparison of probabilities, and thus by *reflection* the course of duty is seen from the best estimate of practical expediency. And now we say, that if all men be left separately to find each his own duty from either or both of the above sources, there are many purposes essential to the government of man which can never be accomplished.

Even in matters of obligation originating in an *intuitive* perception of right in the nature of things, it is certain that society could not be kept together, if there were no umpire higher than each man's own intuition. For admit that this is the same in kind in all men, and that so far as they see the right, they do and must see it alike, yet it is not and never will be true that all will have the power of intuition equally developed, nor kept equally pure from the perverting influence of sense. Some principles of action absolutely essential to the welfare of society will not be seen at all by multitudes—others will be seen only indistinctly and of course confusedly by the great mass of common minds—and even the strongest intellects, in whom the pure reason is the most clear and calm, will be conscious that they stand only upon the shore of the great ocean of truth, which is every where casting up its treasures from depths which they cannot fathom, and over a region wider than they can explore. How then, on these subjects of *intuition* are we to bring the consciences of men together, and bind them harmoniously with the same obligations? Take as an illustration one fact in the divine government, applicable to many others essential to the well being of any system of moral agents, viz., the obligation that "all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father." This has its ground in the nature of the divine existence in Trinity, and to the all-perfect mind is seen by intuition. But if it depended upon our intuitive perceptions, when would men recognize this obligation? Both on man and angel the obligation rests, and can rest, upon mere authority only. It is a service which is due to the second Person in the Trinity, but no mind unable to fathom the depths of God's

mysterious existence, can bring up this truth and settle the obligation upon the foundation of its own rightness in the nature of things. God must say to man—"this is my Beloved Son, hear him"—and to the high intelligences of heaven—"when he bringeth his only begotten Son into the world, let all the angels of God worship him"—and thus the obligation is fixed upon the conscience of man and angel forever. They cannot settle the rightness of that command upon its own nature, they see only the rightness of the authority which gives it, and which guards it by the awful sanction of "Anathema Maranatha," if it be disobeyed; and this is sufficient. The authority binds the conscience. The mouth of the rebel against this authority will be as effectually sealed in the judgment, as if he had disobeyed after his reason had comprehended the whole ground of the commandment.

This is but one example in the divine government, which may apply in illustration to many cases in all governments. The conscience must often be bound where there can be no intuition of the ground and nature of the principle. Children are to be governed—ignorant adults, barely awake to the consciousness of their moral identity, are to be brought under obligation—Yea, men of the highest intelligence, and even angels and arch-angels must sometimes be commissioned on errands of duty, where authority alone is the only source from which the conscience can be reached.

And if this be true in cases where right and wrong are the objects of *intuition*, how much more so when the duty can be settled only by patient *reflection*? How much more certainly will the minds of men be divided on those subjects of obligation which grow out of general expediency and propriety? A great proportion of social duties lie altogether in this field. They depend upon circumstances. They are to be regulated by general interests, and though it be granted that one side must always have weightier reasons for its adoption than the other, yet how in the multitude of human prejudices and interests will you harmonize the action of society in relation to them? What but some legitimate source of authority can come in here, and fix the line for the regulation of human practice?

There are moreover many particulars, for which there is no definite foundation in the nature of things. They involve practical questions that must be settled in some way, and in which there must also be uniformity of practice, but they have nothing

in their own nature by which they can be precisely settled. Positive enactments—sovereign authority alone is competent to fix the rule and bind the subject to it. On this ground stand very many duties both religious and civil. What in the nature of things could Adam see for the prohibition of the fruits of one tree alone in Paradise? What in the nature of things could be seen to fix the duties of circumcision and the Mosaic purifications? or under the present dispensation, the ordinance of baptism, and the elements of bread and wine in the sacramental supper? Grant that in their adaptation to the ends they were designed to subserve, there is a perceived propriety and fitness. Yet who can so distinguish these from all other things which might subserve the same ends, as *a priori* to say, from the mere nature of the things themselves, these and nothing but these ought to have been selected and observed?

Again, what in the nature of things could have bound the conscience of Abraham to “Get him out of his country, and from his kindred, and from his father’s house, unto a land that God would show him?” or more emphatically still, what in the nature of things could have fixed the obligation of obedience to “take now thy son, thine only son Isaac whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah and offer him there for a burnt offering?” Could the intuitions of reason find here any foundation on which to rest the claims of obligation? Over all this region reason is like the dove of the deluge, there is no place where she can rest. She can only look away to the authority which commands—and which is but fleeing back to the ark she left—before she can find a place for the soul of her foot. In the rightness of the authority alone can reason see here any ground of obligation.

So in relation to human society, a great proportion of its regulations are those for which there is no exclusive reason in the nature of things. At what age precisely shall minority cease, and the youth take the place of a man in civil relations? When shall the right of suffrage be granted, and to whom? When eligible to office? What is the manner of election, and induction, and how long retain office? How shall property be transferred and inherited? How shall contracts be rendered valid, and what seals shall be applied? What shall be the form of judicial oaths, and of all judicial and legislative proceedings? A thousand queries of this nature may be put, and what will you do? Wait till individual reason or reflection settles them,

or let every man do what is right in his own eyes in regard to them? Can society exist where these questions are undecided? No, they must be settled, and you can possibly resort to no other source but simple authority to accomplish it. And when the authority which decides here is legitimate, no man's conscience needs any thing further. The law of his nature binds him in obedience to it just as decisively as if he had all the grounds of obligation beneath his own intuition.

2. *It is necessary to the preservation of society that there be additional sanctions to natural obligation.* The sanctions of natural obligation are the sensations of conscience in view of past actions—complacency for doing right, and compunction for doing wrong. To this may be added the natural consequences of our conduct in the relation of cause and effect. And now even if society could commence with all the advantages of general intelligence and complete holiness, it cannot be proved that these sanctions of natural obligation alone would be sufficient thus to perpetuate it. All probability is against it. Temptation would be present—a thousand occasions to sin would occur, nor is there the probability that with nothing but natural consequences to follow from the sin, it would in all cases be resisted. The increase of capacity and strength of faculties in the individual and those by whom he was surrounded, and over whom he might exert an influence and gain an ascendancy would constantly augment the dangers of pride, ambition, and love of domination. And were there no other barriers than natural conscience, who can believe that they would avail to secure universal obedience? And if sin once entered, there could be no safety to the community. Speedy destruction to the system would be the inevitable issue of its own perverted action. Natural conscience was the only balance-wheel, and when that, too weak to retain its own position or regulate the movements of the different parts, is thrown from its centre, the whole machinery must be rent asunder from its own violence.

All that we can gather from *facts* enforces this conclusion. Man in his original innocence sinned. Holy angels also sinned even when in both cases positive punishment was added to the sanctions of natural conscience. How much more certain the existence of sin when the restraining influence of all positive authority is absent? No one can say, that if God should lay aside all authority in heaven, and leave the angels of light to nothing but the operation of natural obligation, they would

be kept from mingling with hell for a single day. All probability is that sin would soon enter and rage unrestrained, if God withdraw all the influence of heaven but the simple workings of each one's own conscience. All created beings were made for law. From their very nature they require the influence of positive enactments and sanctions. If the force of authority be removed, they are at once unnaturalized, unorganized, and the society which they constitute must fall in ruins. The very thought of anarchy is dreadful to every finite mind which allows itself any serious reflection.

If this would follow in a world of primitive obedience, more certainly would destruction ensue to a system in which the principles of depravity were already acting. Take away all positive retribution from vice and crime, and what security remains but that each one must lie at the mercy of the strongest? The bloody days of Danton and Robespierre would come again, and earth and heaven be robed in sackcloth. The race would fail from the earth; society could not hold together for one generation. The only safety possible would be in throwing the nation back into its elements, and each one fleeing from his fellows to perpetual solitude, where no law is needed but that which lays its obligations upon one individual. Society among men exists, and can be maintained only by superadding the sanctions of positive authority to natural obligation. To this we owe all the blessings which social life has ever imparted. This additional influence is necessary. And in various ways it is afforded by the interposition of positive legislation. It gives distinctness and definiteness to duty, by an explicit and peremptory annunciation of the precepts—it adds the sanction of positive rewards and punishments—it gives vitality and personality to law in the recognition of a living present sovereign—it augments obligation by the exhibition of the lawgiver's own moral character, wishes and sympathies—and finally, it prevents all evasion of penalty through the stifling of conscience, by the consciousness that there is a personal agency in another, whose interest as well as duty it is to arraign, convict, condemn and execute.

Authority is thus essential to the well being of creatures. The sceptre must be held over the head of every rational being, with the sole exception of the Great Supreme and Sovereign Lord of all. But more especially for man. He was made for society. All his natural endowments bespeak the design of a

social existence, and urge him to a communion with his species. He cannot be happy in isolated seclusion. The elements of society are separate individuals it is true, but it is a delusion to suppose that they ever existed in solitude. It is but the dream of theorists, to talk of the organization of civil government by a congregating of separate individuals from all points of the compass, who have left each his solitary cave and come up in his savage wildness to enter into a compact that he will wear clothes, obey laws, and become a civilized and social being. Man never otherwise existed than in society, and as a member of society he must be governed by law, and live submissively under rightful authority. Every influence which goes to weaken the force of law, or strengthen the opinion that man does not need it, is a blow directly at the very vitals of human happiness. It is as foul a treason against the rights of society as is the effort to pervert the principles of natural morality. The moment that legitimate authority is subverted, there is no security for earth or Heaven. Gratifying to the pride of human independence as it may be, to rise above all authority, and obey no law but that which is self-imposed, yet, like every other mad presumption of self-sufficiency, such an attempt can only issue in deeper degradation and ruin. It is not true that man becomes more noble and exalted in proportion as he rises above authority. It is usurping a station which is not his, for which he was never designed, and to which his nature has no adaptation. No being but God can afford to stand beyond the jurisdiction of sovereign authority. Every attempt of men to "be as gods," in this respect, is as truly rebellion against the laws of heaven and their own nature, as was that of our first parents who fell by the same delusive presumption in Eden.

Here would be the place to introduce the arguments from Revelation, viz: *That God, the source of the highest authority, has explicitly enjoined obedience and respect to human authority.* Reference may be made to Matt. 22: 21. Rom. 13: 1, 7. 1 Tim. 2: 12. Titus 3: 1. 1 Pet. 2: 13, 17, etc. in relation to *civil* authority—and to Ex. 20: 12. Luke 2: 51. Eph. 6: 1. Col. 3: 20. 1 Tim. 3: 12, etc. in relation to *parental* authority. But as our object is to present this subject to the reason of man in the light of its own nature, we pass by the declaration of the word of God. Nature teaches the absolute necessity of positive authority for the government of man.

But authority, to be binding, must be legitimate; although

it is not necessary to obligation that the subject should be able to see the rightness of the precept. Yet it is necessary that he should be able to see the rightness of the authority. It is from this perception that the conscience is bound to obedience. The assumption of authority by mere arbitrary power can fix no sense of obligation upon the mind. It is a tyrannical usurpation, and all resistance to it, with the spirit if not the deeds of a Brutus, is the dictate of freedom and nature. The inquiry therefore is of the highest importance,

II. *What is the test of legitimate authority?*

A wide field is here opened before us, but it will not be necessary to our present purpose to explore it very extensively. The following considerations will furnish a sufficient criterion of the legitimacy or validity of the authority exercised.

1. The propriety of the relation between the sovereign and the subject must be consulted.

There is in the nature and relations of things an inherent fitness or unfitness to certain results. This is to be regarded in the estimation of the rightness of the authority. Certain relations in themselves afford a strong presumption for or against the right to command. That in which God stands to his creatures as Creator and Preserver, or a Parent to his children, furnishes *a priori* a strong presumption in favor of the right to exercise authority by the former over the latter. There is a perceived propriety in it. So also between master and servant, teacher and pupil, the ascertained will of the majority, and that of the minority, there is seen a natural fitness, which would of itself lead the mind to fix on the one as the proper depository of authority over the other. It would be doing violence to the natural feelings to invert this order, and change the source of authority to the other side of the relation. This consideration however can only be presumptive. There can be no universal test from this principle alone. Higher reasons may prevail to remove authority from what may be called these natural sources, and righteously invest another with it. The parent may become utterly disqualified to govern his family, the instructor incompetent, and a nation find it necessary to leave many individuals entirely out of the account in making its estimate of the majority. The propriety of the relation therefore affords only presumptive and not positive right to authority. It may be set aside for sufficient reasons, though never without such reasons. Even in the case of the Supreme Being, some-

thing besides creation and preservation is necessary to legitimate authority. If a *malevolent* being had created us and given us laws like himself, rebellion and not obedience would be duty. This therefore is one item which is to be regarded as indicative of the proper source of authority, and which is not to be set aside but for strong countervailing reasons.

2. There must be competent qualifications.

This is an essential element in all valid authority. Where the source of sovereignty is manifestly incompetent to the purposes of authority, it can confer no obligation. The competency is found in the possession of those qualifications which secure the enactment of the best laws and the administration of the best government which the nature of the case permits. The intelligence and habits of the people, the exigencies of their condition, and all the general circumstances which give peculiarity to their character must be taken into the account, and the source of authority, which can rightly claim their obedience, must possess within itself those qualifications which secure to *that* community the best government. There must be intelligence to discern, rectitude to select, and power and decision to execute, the best system of legislation for that people. The possession of these qualities more than any thing else confirms authority. Man must be governed, his nature demands it, and that is the right source of authority which affords the highest security for the best government.

In the divine government all things conspire to its absolute perfection. God's relation to his creatures and his essential attributes ensure perfection in the precept, the penalty, and the execution. There is a government absolutely the best that can be for the subject. It is not essential to a perfect government that it should secure universal obedience. The subject is a distinct agent, and sustains a distinct responsibility, and may therefore be most guilty, while the sovereign and his law are absolutely perfect. If the law is the best for the subject, and its sanctions righteously executed, it has done all that it can do, and is itself perfect though many of its subjects are guilty of wilful disobedience. This is true of the divine government. But in all human governments there can be only an approximation to perfection. No human source of authority can be found competent to secure an infallible system. That source of authority, however, is legitimate which gives the highest security for the greatest attainable degree of perfection. This is the

theory of all correct legislation. Here is the basis of all good government. The general rule of investing the parent with the authority of family government is the highest security for domestic peace and prosperity. In all the different forms of civil governments this principle is the test of its legitimacy—*the best security for the best government*. Not the legitimacy of descent, or the regularity of election self-considered, but these only as means to an end, and connected with the security of the best government for the people. To this test all authority must submit as the proof of its validity. If it cannot endure the application, it is wrong, and ought at once to yield itself to correction; and if it can endure it, it is right, no matter what its form of administration. The most absolute despotism is as legitimate as the authority of a parent, if it secures to the people the best government for their peculiar genius and character, and rebellion against it, is treason of as deep guilt as that against the most popular form of government on earth.

Here is the ground for the inapplicability of popular republican forms of government to many nations. They are not prepared for so much freedom. All governments to be legitimate must be for the good of the governed, and in many instances the will of the majority would not secure it. They are not ripe for a free popular elective system. There is not sufficient intelligence and virtue to make it safe to trust the supreme authority in their hands. It would be to their own destruction. Indeed it is clear that there has never yet been a nation, where it would be safe to carry out fully the principle of intrusting supreme power to a majority. Our own government may approach the nearest to such a state, of any that has yet been administered; but clearly we are yet at a long remove from such a proposition. Who would not shrink from the experiment of throwing the destinies of this nation into the hands of a majority of every man, woman and child within it? But why not do this? Simply because it is clear that it would not secure the best legislation. Yea, there is the most fearful ground of apprehension, that the gateways are already thrown so wide open, that the sweeping flood of vice and licentiousness and popular frenzy which is rolling in shall overwhelm the last hope of freedom forever. If the work of education and moral culture be not pushed forward with a zeal and energy proportioned to the exigencies of the crisis, there can be no other issue. A popular government, administered in such a way as not to secure the

good of the people, is as really usurpation and tyranny as the most arbitrary despotism. There is no political condition so intolerable as hopeless subjection to the passions of a corrupt and ignorant populace. Any nation will flee from its horrors to the sway of the most arbitrary despot in preference. We may wrap ourselves in our false security, and cry "peace and safety" with as much credulity as we will, but if that majority which is to hold the sovereign power of this nation for the next quarter of a century be not both intelligent and virtuous, the knell of republican liberty will, ere that period has passed, have tolled its requiem. The tide of events will set back in the opposite direction. The mass of the people, under the ancient dynasties of the old world, will no longer be seen struggling to free themselves from the oppressions of hereditary power; but even in this new world, the descendants of revolutionary heroes will be obliged, for very safety, to flee back to the strength of monarchy for protection. If the alternative is to lie between the domination of a corrupt, capricious, blind and infatuated populace, or the prompt authority of a monarchical government, there can be no hesitation which *will*, and which *ought* to be chosen. This nation can never rest in a position, where the government does not secure the good of the people to as high a degree as they are prepared to appreciate. If they are not sufficiently virtuous and intelligent for the superior blessings of free republican institutions, they will soon lose them. No form of government can keep human nature to a higher point of elevation, than that for which its own intellectual and moral worth prepares it. For our own preservation we must go back again to the bondage of Egypt, and eat "the leeks and garlicks," and "make brick" as best we may, till another generation shall arise more worthy to enter in and enjoy the promised land. The source of authority, with us as with all other nations, to be legitimate and valid, must be competent to secure to the people the highest political good for which they are qualified.

3. Its legislation must not contravene the claims of natural obligation.

One reason for the necessity of positive authority in the government of man, as we have seen, lies in the fact, that many things essential to the welfare of society can never be settled, by sending each man to direct his conduct by the nature of things. A great proportion of the province of legislation lies without the region of direct intuition. All that we can have,

therefore, to bind the conscience in those cases where the nature of things does not settle the obligation, is the perception of the rightness of the authority. And as another test of the validity of it, we may appeal to reason in all those cases where it comes within the province of reason. Where they are both within the same field, authority must harmonize with reason or all its legislation is a nullity. If a positive precept contradict a plain duty from the nature of things, no authority however high or venerable can make it obligatory. God himself appeals to this standard for the rectitude of his own dealings as a moral governor: "Are not my ways equal"—"Come, let us reason together." And because of the force of this appeal, it is true, that "every mouth will be stopped" in the judgment. God's positive legislation never *may*, and never *does*, contradict the law of nature. Wherever they meet, there is everlasting harmony. Divine authority often reaches beyond the limits of human reason, but never contradicts it.

And when any human authority demands compliance with unnatural laws, and intuitively perceived wrong edicts, no obligation goes with it. Submission is then a crime, and resistance a duty. God has legislated there in the majesty of nature, and all contradictory authority is usurpation. This must, however, be a case of clear intuition. It does not apply to instances of disputed propriety, or prudential expediency. If there is not direct contradiction to a clear case of natural right and conscience, obligation is on the side of obedience; for the reasons which sustain the authority itself, are plainer than those against its legislation.

4. *It must not conflict with any higher authority.*

All sovereignty is supreme within its own jurisdiction. It is absolute so far as its limits extend. But these limits are defined by principles, not persons. One person may come legitimately under the authority of a score of sovereignties. He may owe allegiance to the authority of a college, a parent, civil government, a church, and God's general government. Thus to a single individual the sources of his responsibility may be multiplied indefinitely. There is however a *principle* which settles the limits of his allegiance in the midst of them all. The universal principle is—*a lower source of authority can never bind in conflict with a higher source.* There may perhaps not unfrequently be some difficulty in settling the points of precedence between conflicting authorities. Questions of casuistry may

often arise here which shall require more or less care and discernment to decide correctly. But in all such cases it is because the *fact* is obscure, not because there is any hesitation in regard to the truth of the *principle*. Once settle satisfactorily which is the paramount authority, and the mind no longer hesitates. Obligation to the higher authority rests at once upon the conscience.

It was on this principle that the three pious Jews refused to bow down to Nebuchadnezzar's golden image. A higher authority had forbidden the worship of idols. This also induced Daniel to make his supplication three times a day, notwithstanding the prohibition according to the law of the Medes and Persians. And this too was the ground of the bold and unanswerable appeal of the apostles: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." This is a principle of universal application. A higher authority forever prostrates all obligation from the conflicting claims of a lower. The lower authority in legislating against the enactments of the higher, so far forth nullifies itself and becomes a non-entity.

Enough has now probably been said to show the necessity of authority to the well being of human society, and the criterion of its legitimacy. When under these conditions, authority from any source comes upon man, it binds his conscience as inviolably as the clearest dictate of natural obligation. Yea, it resolves itself ultimately into a natural obligation, for he intuitively perceives the rectitude of the authority, and that is as natural a source of obligation, as when he intuitively perceives the rectitude of the precept. He knows before heaven that he is thus bound, and that disobedience to such authority is a sin against conscience and God. More might be said upon the nature and extent of the *sanctions* by which positive authority is to be sustained, and upon the methods of *administration*, but this is sufficient for the purpose we have had in view, to show the nature of positive authority as a source of moral obligation.

The following truths result directly from the foregoing view of this subject.

1. *Authority may give obligation to that which would otherwise have been a matter of indifference.*

If the proper source of authority deem any particular course of procedure, form, or ceremony, to be important in gaining

the ends for which it exists, it has a right to impose them. And though otherwise a matter of entire indifference, they are henceforth binding upon the subject. The rightness of the authority settles the question of obligation. Divine authority has thus settled the proportion of time to be observed as holy, and fixed the particular day, which is henceforth binding upon man, though in itself considered we may not be able to see why it was a seventh rather than a sixth or an eighth part of time, and though it be a matter of indifference in its own nature which day of the week should be observed as the Sabbath. After the enactments of authority, it is a matter of indifference no longer. So in civil governments, the forms of official investiture, the solemnization of the marriage contract, the naturalization of foreigners, the specific regulations relating to revenue, etc. all are matters of indifference in themselves, i. e. other forms might have been substituted that would equally well have subserved the same ends. The good of society, however, requires that these matters should be regulated in practice upon some principle of uniformity, and when the proper authority has done it, it is no longer optional with each man to follow his own private views of expediency or inclination in relation to it. He is bound as a good citizen and a conscientious man faithfully to obey the law. A father may in the same way settle in his own family many regulations in themselves wholly indifferent, and yet when thus settled by parental authority, no member of that family is at liberty to disregard them. We believe the consciences of many professing Christians need quickening on this point. There is too great a readiness in matters of this kind, where the law may interfere with private interest, prejudice, or convenience, to evade or directly disobey it, and keep the conscience quiet by the fact of its original indifference to moral obligation. The truth is, however, that neither in the sight of God nor an enlightened conscience, is it any longer a matter of indifference. The rightful authority under which you live, is a source of obligation as rigidly imperious as the dictates of natural intuition. If you disobey or disregard it, you can ~~neither~~ be a good citizen, a good Christian, nor an honest man. ~~Whose~~ conscience soever it may be that thus slumbers, ~~needs at once to be~~ aroused by its direct application to the ~~point~~ of responsibility. Authority, as a source of moral obligation, ~~should be placed~~ prominently before the mind, and the ~~man~~ habituate himself to

the reflection, not—this thing is a matter of indifference in itself—but my conduct in relation to it is against law. If such reflections be suppressed, the fact is not at all improbable, that while you are searing your own moral sensibilities, you are also directly contributing the whole force of your influence, in these respects, to paralyze the power of law over others.

2. *A refusal to obey, unless the reasonableness of the precept be exhibited, makes the man either a rebel or an outlaw.*

To this extent every man has the right to demand evidence before he can come under obligation—that the source of authority be legitimate, and that the legislation neither contradicts nature nor higher authority. And this is all he can claim. The sovereign is not obliged to explain the reasons for every precept to his comprehension. If he understand *what* it is, this is enough without explaining *why* it is. If he be legitimately circumscribed within the jurisdiction of the authority, he is bound to yield obedience to it. If he is already a subject, his refusal to obey without seeing the reasonableness of the command makes him a *rebel*; if his voluntary consent is necessary in order to his becoming a subject, and he will not obey the law without the reason, he is an *outlaw*. In the first place, he assumes to himself the place of the sovereign, and attempts to give law to the authority which binds him, and he must be subdued or the power of the government is prostrate. In the second, he discards authority upon its own territory where it must be supreme, and thus makes it necessary that he should be forced beyond the limits of its jurisdiction. By refusing allegiance to it upon its own grounds, he cuts himself off from all right to its privileges and protection, and that government owes it to its own dignity and safety to banish him from the community. In the one case the authority, for its own preservation, must punish, in the other case it must expel. And such is the law of every man's conscience, that he will be obliged to yield to the equity of such a decision, and his mouth be stopped in every attempt to reply against it.

3. *The spirit of law fills the whole field of its jurisdiction.*

So far as authority extends, it is omniscient, omnipresent and supreme. It goes with every subject to his daily employment and his secret retirement. Like the eye of God, it watches his going out and coming in, his lying down and rising up. Its protective power is over every place, and no harm can enter but by the very act which violates its sacredness, and for which

it must mete out the merited retribution. So also is it every where with its approbation for obedience, and disapprobation for disobedience. Though hidden from every human eye the deed of violation is not hidden from law—its pure spirit has been wounded—and an hour of reckoning must come. At that great day when all things shall be seen as they are, then will every law under which we have acted be present with its testimony. The wound given to authority even in the most secluded secretness, will then be an open wound in our own consciences, defying further concealment, and inflicting the retribution precisely proportioned to demerit.

Man may have forgotten or despised the authority which bound him, but that can never overlook the transgressions committed against itself, nor refuse to lift its voice against him when the record of his sins is to be publicly authenticated. Whether it were some smothered deed of darkness, or more deeply covered still, some foul purpose or malignant passion deep within the bosom, the eye of law was there a living witness to the guilt. Secrecy of wickedness is impossible, for the spirit of legitimate authority is every where, to see, to feel, and at the appointed time to testify.

4. Disobedience to the lowest rightful authority is as truly sin in the sight of heaven, as disobedience against the highest.

The degree of guilt is to be estimated by both the majesty of the authority and the strength of wilful rebellion. The same degree of wilful rebellion against a positive command of God, is doubtless more heinous than the same degree of rebellion against the law of man. But it is not problematical, that in the day of final reckoning when all sin shall be weighed according to its real demerit, that many transgressions of human law shall be found to involve more guilt in the sight of God, than many other transgressions of divine law. The difference in wilful and depraved rebellion may have far more than counterbalanced the difference which would accrue from the distinction of authority. The conscience may have been more wounded, the soul more defiled by the former, than the latter. It is not very unlikely that at the last day it will be seen, that the motives and feelings by which we have been actuated in disobeying some of the laws of the land, have laid a heavier weight in the balances of the judgment against us, than some other violations of the direct commands of heaven. We are not to estimate guilt solely by the nature of the law we violate. We may be greater sinners in

violating positive authority, than others are in violating intuitive right, and greater in violating human authority than others in violating God's authority. God will at the last day throw all the various circumstances of light, and knowledge, and privilege, and the temper of mind, and wilfulness of purpose, into the estimate by which the retributions of eternity are to be awarded. This makes our responsibilities most fearfully solemn. We must carry to the judgment, a character formed under the influences of every source of authority which has reached us, and it will not be the same to us in eternity in relation to any of them, whether they have been obeyed or disobeyed. All will be there to lay a burden upon the soul in proportion both to the weight of the authority, and the wilfulness of the rebellion.

ARTICLE III.

THE VERSION OF ULPHILAS AND THE MOESO-GOTHIC LANGUAGE.

By W. W. Greenough, Cambridge, Ms.

MODERN ethnographers have supposed that the North and Middle of Europe were settled by three successive emigrations from the East. The Celts came first, and were finally scattered throughout the western parts of Europe on the borders of the Atlantic; and also formed the population of the British Isles. The German, Teutonic, or Gothic tribes followed them, and these last were pushed into the centre and north of Europe by the Slavonic nations. It is with the second of these emigrations, the Teutonic, that we are concerned.

The earlier information of the Greek and Roman writers with regard to the more northern nations of Europe was exceedingly meagre and unsatisfactory. When the intelligence, that Rome had been sacked by the Gauls, B. C. 392, was first received at Athens, it was said* that the conquerors were the Hyperboreans, a people who had descended the icy mountains from the unknown regions of the north. Herodotus, writing about B. C. 330, calls the Celts *οἱ ἔσχατοι πρὸς ἡλίου δυσμέων*, and is so

* Plutarch Camill. c. 22.

uncertain about their location, that he places them beyond the pillars of Hercules.* But of the Germans, though not mentioned under the name which they received in after years, he evidently had a more distinct knowledge. Among the Scythian tribes, one is called by him the *Boudinoi*, who were *ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολλόν*, a great nation with blue eyes and red hair, living in a country covered with a dense forest, in the midst of which was a great lake;† and he adds that they were a nomadic race, and spoke a different language from the Scythians. Taking into account their physical character as differing from the other race of Scythians ‘bald, with flat noses and large chins,’‡ and the relative position of the other Scythian tribes mentioned by the great historian, we can trace a part of the Germans to their first situation on the shores of the Euxine.

But, shortly after the time of Herodotus, a more certain knowledge of the great Teutonic race was attained through the boldness of Pytheas of Marseilles, celebrated equally for his learning and his maritime discoveries. He had already reached the Casseterides, and about B. C. 320 he sailed to Thule,§ (probably Tellemarck, Norway,)|| and from thence directed his course southward, and afterwards eastward to the amber coasts.¶ There he found two nations, whom he calls Teutones and Guttones. We see no reason to doubt (as many have), the identity of the Guttones, with the Gothones, the Gothi, and the Goths, who make so distinguished a figure in the early history of the dark ages. The Gothones, dwelt near the mouth of the Vistula, and on the shores of the Baltic, A. D. 80 and 180, and if they were not the nation with whom Pytheas met, the coincidence of names is at least very striking.**

The Gothones†† appear first in history as a part of the Mar-

* B. II. 33. IV. 49.

† Herod. IV. 108. Mannert's *Alte Geographie*, Vol. III. chap. 3.

‡ Ib. IV. 23.

§ Strabo, I. 63. II. 114.

|| Adelung *ält. Geschich. der Deutschen*, p. 80.

¶ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XXXVII. 2.

** Those who are interested in the controversy can consult Adelung, *ält. Geschich. der Deut.* p. 87 and 200. Mannert's *Geog.* Vol. III. p. 353. Bosworth, *Pref. to Ang. Sax. Dict.* p. 113.

†† Guttones, Pliny after Pytheas. Gothones and Gotones, Tacitus. *Γυθώνες*, Ptolem. Gothi and Gotthi by the writers of the third and following centuries. Cossini of Steph. of Byzantium § 490. Adelung, p. 94. They are also by mistake called by some writers Getae, Sar-

comannic league, B. C. 19. But until they began to emigrate, little or nothing is known of them. The cause of these emigrations has not yet been satisfactorily ascertained, but it is in the highest degree probable that they were compulsory, the result of distress, perhaps pestilence, famine, or an overplus of population; or the pressure of a superior power, like movements of a similar nature in later times. The representation that their removal was in consequence of extraordinary prosperity is to be regarded as a fiction of the bards for the purpose of flattering their countrymen.* Be that as it may, the Gothic nations left the eastern bank of the Vistula between the reigns of the Antonines and of Alexander Severus. A portion of these tribes probably crossed the Baltic, and settled in Sweden and the isle of Gothland.† The remainder, forming the larger part, wandered through the eastern part of Germany, and the plains of Poland and Russia, swelling their ranks with the tribes which they conquered. Then passing by the lower Danube, they overran and settled the north coasts of the Black Sea.‡ Afterwards allured by the rich fields of Dacia, they carried their arms through that country with equal success; and from thence into Moesia. The relaxed discipline of the Roman armies was unable to withstand their fierce valor; they took by storm the city of Philippopolis, and completed their triumph by the defeat and slaughter of the Roman emperor Decius. But afterwards, about A. D. 250, they were in turn defeated; and pursued beyond the Danube by Aemilianus, the governor of Pannonia and Moesia.

When in Dacia, the Goths divided themselves into two portions, and settled at either extremity of that country: those dwelling in the west, took the name of Visigothi, Vesegothae, West-Goths, and the inhabitants of the eastern part were called

mati, and Scythians.—The Gothoni of Tacitus, and Kotini of Dio were a Gallic race.

* Niebuhr, Hist. of Rome, Vol. II. p. 387.

† Jornandes asserts that the Gothic people *originally* issued from Scandinavia, called by the ancients *vagina gentium*, and describes the manner in which they came over. But no reliance is to be placed on his account, as it so evidently contradicts all historical testimony with regard to the settlement of Germany.

‡ These were supposed by the Greeks and Romans to be Scythians. More of this hereafter.

Ostro- or Austro-Gothi, East-Goths. There is no real foundation for the assertion of Cassiodorus, so carefully repeated by Jornandes,* that they obtained those denominations from their (supposed) original seats in Scandinavia. The work of the former historian was produced when the Goths were in power in Italy, and for the purpose of flattering the conquerors, while that of Jornandes was merely an abridgment of his predecessor's labors.

At the time that the Goths conquered West Dacia, they found there the Getae, a Thracian tribe, by many supposed to be identical with the Goths. This error has probably arisen from the fact that the Getae amalgamated with their conquerors. But there is no doubt of the Germanic origin of this nation; taking into consideration the circumstance that Germanic tribes were scattered through Scythia, (which will be considered more at length hereafter,) it will not add to the difficulties of the question when we find that Herodotus and Ovid speak of this people as a Scythian nation. But Ovid was evidently describing a German people when he spoke of the 'flavi Coralli,' and more particularly

Mixta sit haec (gens) quamvis inter Graiosque Getasque,
A male pacatis plus trahit ora Getis,
Vox fera, trux vultus, verissima Martis imago,
Non coma, non ulla barba resecta manu.†

Compare this description with that of Tacitus, and it will be seen that the poet and historian had before their eyes the same people. It must likewise be borne in mind that Herodotus speaks of two races of Scythians; one with blue eyes, and red or light hair; and another, among whom are the Agrippaei 'bald from their birth, both males and females, with flat noses and large chins.'§

The Ostrogoths and Visigoths from the early part of the third century remained two distinct nations. When the latter people settled in Dacia, Christianity was already established there, and that it was embraced by them at an early period after their settlement, is known from the fact that the signature of Theophilus, the bishop of the West Goths, appears in the

* c. 17. de Goth. sive Get. Orig. † Epist de Pont. lib. IV. ch. II.

‡ Ovid. Trist. lib. V. Eleg. VII. 11. Wiseman's Lect. p. 98. Note.

§ Herod. IV. 23. Vide more at length Hippocrates, p. 292. Niebuhr's kleine Schriften, p. 362.

records of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325. The christian Goths remained in this country, until they were attacked by the Huns, a nation from the north of China or Tartary: they were consequently induced to request the protection of the emperor Valens, which was done through the intervention of their bishop Ulphilas. Moesia, (now Servia, and Bulgaria,) was assigned them as a residence, and they emigrated into that country about A. D. 376. Jornandes gives the following description of their situation: "Ad pedes enim montis gens multa sedit pauper et imbellis, nihil abundans, nisi armento diversi generis pecorum et pascuis, silvaque lignorum, patum habens tritici, caeterarum specierum est terra faecunda. Vineas vero, nec si sunt alibi, certi eorum cognoscent, ex vicinis locis sibi vinum negociantes, nam lacte aluntur.*" It seems then that their manner of living did not differ from that of the German tribes in the time of Tacitus.†

But their nomadic character was not destined to endure. The influence and example of the other Goths led them on, and the long and bloody history of their contests with the Roman and Byzantine legions now commenced. Under Alaric, in 396, they made an irruption into Greece, conquered the Peloponnesus, and their leader became prefect of Illyria and king of the West Goths. Early in the fifth century, he led his armies into Italy, and twice sacked Rome, and from thence marched into Spain, where in 412 was founded a kingdom, which, after a space of about three hundred years, during the reign of Roderick, was conquered by the Saracens. The Visigoths here disappear from history. The Ostrogoths were more unfortunate. They were not permitted to enter Moesia for protection against the ravages of the Huns, and were therefore overcome by that horde of barbarians. About the middle of the fifth century, they liberated themselves, and embraced Christianity. After the fall of the Western Empire under Odeacer, the emperor Zeno, in the year 489, induced Theodoric, the king of the Ostrogoths, to march into Italy; and in 493, the latter became king of Italy, and laid the foundation of a new Ostrogothic empire, which included within its limits, (besides Italy,) Rhaetia, Vindelicia, Noricum, Dalmatia, Pannonia, and Dacia beyond the Danube. Of this immense empire, he made Ravenna the capital. The Gothic rule lasted

* De rebus Get. c. 51.

† De Mor. Germ. 5, 15, 23.

about sixty years, and was terminated by the victories of Belisarius and Narsus.

It is in the Moeso-Gothic,* that we find the first specimen of Germanic literature ; viz. the famous version of the Bible made by Ulphilas,† the bishop and primate of the Moeso-Goths. The brevity of the notices of Ulphilas, in the works of the contemporary historians, Philostorgius, Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoret, leaves us in great uncertainty with regard to his origin, and the prominent events of his life. The account given by Philostorgius is exceptionable, from the known partiality of that writer's views. He states that Ulphilas was not a Goth, but a Cappadocian by birth ; that his kindred and ancestors were Christians, and inhabitants of the small town Sadagottina in Cappadocia ; and were carried away prisoners by the Goths, during their great inroad into Lydia, Bythynia, Phrygia and Cappadocia in the year 266, by means of which the christian religion was introduced among the conquerors. But on the other hand, the German name of Ulphilas (Wölflein,) the great reverence in which he was held by the Goths, his translation of the Bible into the Gothic language, in addition to the bad reputation of Philostorgius as a historian, and the opposition of his testimony to that of his contemporaries, are sufficient to prove the Gothic origin of Ulphilas. It is indeed said, that the parents of the bishop, if Cappadocian, had become domesticated among the Goths, and had so far adopted the language and habits of that people, that they might have given their son a Gothic name. But there is no evidence to substantiate this supposition by proofs ; and the charge of Arianism equally wants confirmation.

All that is known certainly with regard to Ulphilas may be told in a very few words. From the year 360 to about 380, he was bishop of the christian Goths in Dacia, Thrace, and Moesia. In the year 359, he attended the synod at Constantinople. Afterwards, before 376, he was twice sent by his people to the emperor Valens, and successfully executed their commission to obtain protection against the Huns : and in

* The Goths after their settlement of Moesia, were called Moeso-Goths.

† Variouslly written ; Urphilas, Urphilus, Gilsulas, Gudillas, Gal-filas, Gulfilas, Ulphias, Ulpias, Gulfias, Hulfias, Wulfila, etc. *Büsching.* § 22.

accordance with the permission of the emperor, the Goths, in number 200,000 under Fritigern and Ablavius crossed the Danube, and settled in Moesia: with them went Ulphilas. The time of his death is unknown, but it probably took place in 379 or 380, as under Theodosius, Theotimus went to Tomis as bishop of the Goths. No one before or after his time was so useful to the Goths, and they appreciated his worth; his learning and his virtues were so well known that they passed into a proverb: Whatever is done by Ulphilas, is well done. The two most prominent actions of his life, are the (so-called) invention of the Gothic Alphabet, and the translation of the Holy Scriptures into Moeso-Gothic.*

The testimonies of the early historians concur in ascribing the invention of the Moeso-Gothic Alphabet to Ulphilas. Socrates, who flourished about 440 says *Οὐλφίλας ὁ τῶν Γότθων ἐπίσκοπος γράμματα ἐφεῦρε Γότθικὰ*. Sozomenus witnesses *πρῶτος δὲ γραμμάτων εὐρείης αὐτὸς ἐγένετο*† and Philostorgius§ gives the same account. But there are many considerations which will lead us to modify, if not to entirely set aside their relations.

It will be granted that Ulphilas, in translating the Scriptures into his native tongue, designed that they should be extensively circulated, and that they should be accessible to all who could read. If then he invented the characters in which the translation was to be written, who would have read it after it was completed?—particularly if the countrymen of Ulphilas were acquainted with other alphabets, and even had one of their own before, as we shall prove. Even supposing that the bishop invented it, is it not in the last degree surprising that the alphabet (with the exception of two letters only) should coincide in the form of its characters with the alphabets of nations with whom his people had intercourse?

Had the Germanic nations an alphabet, and were letters in use among them?

We have the strongest reason to believe that the Runic letters were in actual use throughout the whole North of Europe from the remotest ages. They originated in the East, and were carried into Europe by the Teutonic and Scandina-

* Zahn's Ulphilas. Hist. Crit. Einleitung, p. 19—21.

† Hist. Eccles. L. IV. c. 33.

‡ Hist. Eccl. L. VI. 37.

§ Hist. Eccl. L. II. 5.

vian tribes. Runic inscriptions have been found in Tartary,* which fact will not appear strange when we learn that the family of Gothic nations once occupied large tracts of Tartary, that some of its branches inhabited Transoxana, and were found even as far as the Altai mountains. They were well known to the people of Eastern Asia who could not fail to be struck by the singularity of their language, their light hair, blue eyes, and white complexions; traits particularly remarkable in the midst of men dark-colored, with brown eyes and dark hair, who have in the end occupied their place. The distinguished orientalist, M. Abel-Remusat, from whose valuable researches the above is taken, adds, "the facts which I have collected on these points are so numerous and so positively set forth in the Chinese writers, that no doubt can remain."† Death prevented him from publishing these proofs.

But the learned geographer, professor Ritter of Berlin, has since solved all difficulties, by proving that the Chinese writers refer frequently to nomadic races, having blue eyes and red hair, and that they relate, that in the second century (B. C. 177) before Christ, a portion of one of these tribes, having been driven westward by the Hiong-nu, inhabited the shores of Lake Bhal-kush, and the river Ili, under the name of U-sun or U-siun;‡ afterwards, probably during the fourth century, they emigrated southward.§ Five other races are mentioned by the Chinese annalists, as having blue eyes and red hair: viz., the Schu-le or Khin-scha; the Khute, west of the U-sun; the Ting-ling, north of the U-sun, and west of lake Baikal; the Kian-kuan or Hakas, on the Yenesei; and the Alan or Yan-thsai, north of the Caspian Sea.|| We regret that our limits forbid us to enter more deeply upon this highly interesting subject.

But to return to the Runic letters. In an ode quoted by Bartholin,¶ the poet ascribes their invention to Odin: "The letters which the great ancient traced out; which the gods com-

* Mallet's Northern Antiquities. Vol. I. p. 312. note.

† Recherches sur les Langues Tartares. Prelim. p. xliv. and xlv. Wiseman's Lectures, p. 101. Am. Ed.

‡ Called Hieou-siun by the older, and Ou-siun by the later Chinese writers. An etymologist might perhaps imagine that he has here discovered the original form of the word Suiones.

§ Ritter's Erdkunde, Vol. II. Part 1. p. 194. and 431—7.

|| Ib. p. 434.

¶ Edda Isl. p. 649.

posed; which Odin the sovereign of the gods engraved." This is equivalent to a declaration that they had been so long in use that their origin was unknown. The attempt indeed has been made to prove that the ancient Germans had no written alphabet, but the passage in Tacitus* on which the assertion is founded, is now decided to have been misunderstood. It is at least certain that they were extensively in use among the heathen nations in the north of Europe. That they were not derived from the Roman alphabet, as has been supposed by some, is shown by their difference of formation, and by the smaller number (sixteen) of the Runic letters, which likewise is a proof of their great antiquity, and perhaps too, of their eastern origin. Runic staves are mentioned by Venantius Fortunatus, a Latin poet of the sixth century :

Barbara fraxineis pingatur Runa tabellis
Quodque Papyrus agit, virgula plana valet.†

If then Runic characters were in use, among any of the German tribes, from their close connection, and the identity or similarity of their customs, it may safely be inferred that they were known and in use among the Goths.

But the Goths were likewise acquainted with the Greek and Latin alphabets. After the Gothic settlement of Dacia and Moesia, the new inhabitants were in habits of constant and intimate intercourse with the Greeks and Romans. MSS. and epistles in both these languages were within the reach of the more intelligent. Knowing then that the learned Ulphilas was acquainted with the Runic, Greek and Roman alphabets, it would be natural to suppose that he would have made use of them in the formation of a new alphabet. This would have been probable, even if every vestige of the language and alphabet had been lost. Let us then compare the Moeso-Gothic characters with the Runic, Greek, and Latin alphabets, and from the points of agreement, and difference, we shall be able to decide how far Ulphilas was indebted to them, and what is original with himself.

Ulphilas, then, drew from the Greeks the forms of g (c), l, p, u (y), and x. From the Latin were borrowed u (qu), h, g (g and j), d. The forms common to both languages are e,

* Germ. 10.

† Lib. VII. epig. 18. Vid. Wormii Literat. Runic. p. 7.

z, k, m, n, o. These conclusions are formed from a careful examination of the letters in use among the Greeks and Romans from the first to the sixth century.*

From the Runic was taken the character u.

The letters common to the Latin, Greek, and Runic are a, b, i, r, s, t, f.

He invented ψ, th, and Θ, hw, or took them from an old Germanic alphabet now lost.†

The word *invention*, as used by the Greek historians must merely signify an *adoption* by Ulphilas of other alphabets for the written Moeso-Gothic. The Greeks had probably never heard of the Gothic alphabet until brought among them by Ulphilas. The introducer at once became the inventor.‡

These Gothic characters after the fall of the western empire were extensively used throughout Europe, but were thrown aside soon after the French adopted the Roman letters. At a meeting of the synod, held in Lyons in 1091, the Spaniards totally abolished their use.§

The voice of history unanimously proclaims Ulphilas to be the translator of the Scriptures into his own tongue. One historian|| states that the book of Kings, (which then included the two books of Samuel,) was omitted because its nature was such as to excite the fierce and warlike passions of the Goths. But the books of Moses, Joshua, and Judges are open to the same objection. And the other historians are always particular in speaking of τὰς θείας γραφὰς, ἱερὰς βίβλους, divinas scripturas.¶ The time occupied in translation has been variously stated, many supposing it to have been the work of twenty years, from 360 to 380. But Socrates intimates,** and the language of the version proves, that it was done after the Goths settled in Moesia. If then the death of Ulphilas took place in 379, as is generally believed, the task must have been accomplished be-

* See Baumlein's Tables at the end of his *Untersuchungen*.

† The Greek appears to have been the ground work: eighteen letters are common to the two alphabets. The connection of the Goths with the Greeks was more intimate than with the Romans.

‡ Mallet's *Northern Antiquities*, Vol. I. p. 311.

§ Priestley's *Lect. on Theory of Languages*, etc. p. 41.

|| Philostorgius. *Hist. Eccl.* II. 5.

¶ This question is definitely settled by the discoveries of Maio.

** L. IV. c. 33.

tween 376, the year of emigration beyond the Danube, and that year. Industrious and learned, a perfect master of his own language, though no grammatical treatises probably existed, he found little difficulty in expressing exactly the sense of the original.

It was long a matter of dispute whether the translation was made from the Greek or Latin; but the question is now pretty generally decided in favor of the Greek. We shall briefly sum up the arguments for the latter belief.

1. The orthography observed. EI=I: Γ before Γ and K=N.

2. The etymological care. Ulphilas took the greatest pains to render as literally as possible the sense of the Greek, particularly in accordance with the etymology. Thus he translates πάντων ὁλοκαυτωμάτων, ALLAIM THAIM ALLBRUNSTIM, Mark 12: 33. Examples of this nature are to be met with on every page.*

3. It is to be observed that the order and language of the Greek text was most scrupulously followed as far as the Gothic idiom would allow. The translator frequently uses the article sa, so, thata, to correspond with the Greek article, and places it in the same relative position. An instance of this is found in Mark 15: 39, ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ, sa manna sa sunus was goths. The article is likewise often omitted, where it is wanting in the original, as θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός, goths im sunus.† In many passages the Gothic remains faithful to the Greek, when all Latin versions leave it; e. g. οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ποιμένες is rendered in Gothic by jah thai mans thai hairdjōs;‡ not any, even of the Codices in Blanchini, have viri pastores.§ In order to show how closely the Gothic follows the Greek, we select at random a part of the parable of the sower, and give it below in both languages, with a literal Latin translation.

<i>Greek.</i>	Ἐξῆλθεν	ὁ	σπείρων	τοῦ	σπείραι	τὸν	σπόρον	αὐτοῦ	καὶ
<i>Gothic.</i>	Urranu	saiands	du	saian	fraiwa	seinamma.	jah		
<i>Latin.</i>	Exiit	serens	ad	serere	semini	suo.	et		
	ἐν	τῷ	σπείρειν	αὐτόν,	ὃ	μὲν	ἔπασε	παρὰ	τὴν
	miththanei	saiso.	sum	gadraus	faur	wig.	jah		
	interim	sevit,	quoddam	concidit	ante	viam.	et		

* Hug's Introduct. p. 295.

† John 10: 36.

‡ Luke 2: 15.

§ Zahn's Ulphilas. Introd. p. 30.

κατεπατήθη, καὶ τὰ πτεῖνα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφαγεν αὐτό. καὶ
 gatrudon warth, jah fuglos himinis fretun thata. jah
 conculcatum fiebat et aves coeli vorrunt hoc et
 ἄλλον ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· καὶ φύν ἐξηράνθη,
 anthar gadraus ana staina jah uskijanata gathaursnoda,
 aliud concidit super lapida et enatum exaruit
 διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα.
 in thizei ni habaida qurammitha.
 propter quod non habuit humorem.

4. The mistakes made. The translator in Matt. 27: 52, read *κειμένων* for *κεκειμημένων*: in Luke 7: 25, *τροφὴ* for *τροφή*. See also Luke 3: 14. John 16: 6. Matt. 8: 9.*

5. It is easy to see that the translation was made from a MS. of the Constantinopolitan recension, though there seem cases in which Ulphilas does not follow Lucian. We have not room to bring passages into actual juxta-position, but by turning to Hug, p. 296—7, the inquirer cannot fail to satisfy himself.

The version of Ulphilas was not long allowed to remain without corruption. In the MSS. one of the Latin versions is sometimes found written side by side with the Gothic;† and when the texts differed, the Gothic was altered so as to agree with the Latin, though perhaps at times merely for the purpose of making the line and verses of each to correspond.‡ When not actually brought together collations were made, and marginal notes inserted, which were afterwards incorporated into the text. Many therefore are the corruptions which exist in a text intended as an exact translation of the Lucianian recension. And this also accounts for the error into which some learned men have fallen in supposing the Gothic version to be founded on the Latin.

There is but one voice among the learned as to the value of this translation. It precedes the version of Jerome, and must be preferred to that by the critics of the New Testament. It adds another to the glorious links of the chain which binds all nations together in unity of faith, proving that the doctrines of the christian religion were not founded on human wisdom, but were established by divine authority. Every new version discovered adds still greater weight to the integrity and purity of

* Compare with these passages the Cod. Brixianus. See Hug's Introd. p. 295—6, and Zahn's Ulphilas, p. 30 for other examples.

† Vide Fragments of Epist. to Romans.

‡ Hug Introd. p. 297.

the Holy Scriptures, for false readings cannot be found in all MSS. But who shall judge between the false and the true?

Of this great translation of Ulphilas, only fragments remain. The history of the different portions, and of their transmission to us is rather curious.

The first specimen found was the Codex Argenteus, so called from its letters of silver. The early history of this MS. is wrapped in great obscurity. It was doubtless made in the fifth or sixth century when the Goths were in power in Italy, but where it was preserved during the next thousand years is not known. For a long time it was in the Abbey of Werden on the river Rhur in Westphalia. From thence it was carried to Prague, and when Count Königsmark took that city in 1648, it fell into his hands. The Count sent it as a present to Queen Christiana, who deposited it in the Royal Library at Stockholm. The MS. did not remain there long, but went out of the kingdom with Isaac Voss in 1655. Whether it came into his possession honestly, is still uncertain; many have unhesitatingly accused him of appropriating it to himself without leave. But the probability is that the Codex was presented to him by the queen, who was his patron and friend.* While in his hands,† his uncle Francis Junius, the great northern philologist transcribed and printed it together with a version in Anglo-Saxon.‡

But the MS. was shortly destined to find its way back into Sweden. When Puffendorf (probably Esaias) was travelling in Holland in 1662, hearing that it was in the possession of Voss, he purchased it for the Count Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, at the price of four hundred rix dollars.§ The Count had it bound in silver, and in 1669 he presented it to the library of the university of Upsal, where it now remains.

* Hug says that the Swedish account of the matter in the Transactions of the Societ. Scient. Upsaliensis is to be preferred. See also Askenholz Memoires de la Reine Christine. Tom. I. § 307.

† Jacobus Grimm. Hymnorum Veteris Ecclesiae XXV. Interpretatio theotisca nunc primum edita. Gottingae, 1830. p. 2.

‡ Quatuor D. N. Jesu Christi evangeliorum versiones perantiquae duae Gothica scilicet et Anglo-Saxonica, etc. Dordrecht typis et sumptibus Junianis, 1665.

§ Accounts differ with regard to the sum paid. It is variously stated at 500, 600, and 800 rix dollars, and even as high as 2000 ducats.

With it, he sent an exact copy by Derrer (a monk at Werden,) which was destroyed by the great fire at Upsal in 1702.

The MS. is called, as before observed, the *Codex Argenteus* from its letters ; which are beautiful uncial characters of silver on purple colored parchment of a quarto form. The following account of its present state is given by Hug. "The initial lines of the Gospels and the first line of every section are in gold letters. Below, between columns drawn in barbarous taste according to neither of the known orders of architecture, are inserted the Canons of Eusebius, and at the side are appended the numbers referring to them. The Gospels are in the following order: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. The letters do not appear to have been written with a pen or reed, but to have been impressed by means of carved or cast stamps, nearly in the same way as book-binders put titles upon the backs of books in gold or silver. The perfect uniformity of the letters, the indentations which they make in the page, the traces of paste sometimes visible between the silver and the parchment—render such a supposition credible, whatever may be said to the contrary by hasty travellers and superficial observers."* The MSS. at Brescia and Verona which are written in silver, and the fragments of Matthew in the Vatican, have no indentations, nor any appearance of paste.†

The second fragment discovered, is called the *Codex Carolinus*, and is a palimpsest. It was detected by Knittel Archdeacon of Wolfenbüttel, Duchy of Brunswick, in 1756, while examining a MS. of the *Origines* of Isidore, written in Spain about the ninth century, he found that there was an older writing beneath. After great labor and care, he made out fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, in the same language and character as the Codex at Upsal, with a Latin version older than Jerome's by the side of the text. The following fragments were discovered. Rom. 11: 33, 34, 35, 36 ; 12: 1—5 and 17—21 ; 13: 1—5 ; 14: 9—26 ; 15: 3—13. They were first published by Knittel and afterwards by Ihre, Busching, and Zahn.‡

* Hug's *Introd.* p. 285.

† *Ibid.* p. 286. See also Horne's *Introd.* Vol. III. p. 241, and in the *Bibliographical Appendix*, Pt. I. c. 1. Sect. V. § 4. [II.] will be found a list of editions.

‡ It was called the *Codex Carolinus* in honor of Charles the reigning Duke of Brunswick, at the time of the discovery of the MS.

The indefatigable Angelo Maio discovered, beneath the Homilies of Gregory the Great on Ezekiel, a MS. of the eighth century, fragments of all Paul's Epistles except to the Thessalonians. A second MS. of the ninth century, containing Jerome's exposition of Isaiah, was found to conceal Gothic relics of the same epistles with the same omissions. He afterwards brought to light a portion of Matthew, supplying a chasm in the Codex Argenteus. These with other Gothic fragments of a calendar, of the Old Testament, and a Homily, were published by Maio and Count Castiglione in 1819.*

The other relics of the language are few, and comparatively of slight importance, as they contain no new words. We give a brief account of them below.

1. A deed of sale at Naples which was discovered in recent times ; it was once preserved in the archives of the Church St. Annunciata, but is now in the Royal Library, at Naples. It bears no date, but appears to have been written soon after the invasion of Italy by the Goths, probably about 551. The priests of the Church St. Anastasia† bought some land, and the contract is subscribed and attested in both Latin and Gothic. These documents are chiefly valuable on account of the certainty which they add to the genuineness of the Codex Argenteus. Of the four Gothic attestations one is given below with a Latin translation.

G. Ik merila bokareis handau meinai ufmelida jah andn(emum)

L. Ego merila librarius manu mea subscripsi et accepimus skilliggans .I. jah faurthis thairh kaytsjon jah mith dia(kona) (ala)-solidos 60 et antea per cautionem et cum Diakono — moda† unsaramma jah mithgahlaibim unsaraim audnemun (skilig)— nostro et comministris nostris accepimus solidos 120 pretium horum paludum.§

2. Deed of sale at Arezzo, written on papyrus ; a contract in barbarous Latin between a Deacon Gotlieb and another Deacon Alamud. Among several Latin subscriptions we find but

* For further particulars, see Hug's *Introd.* p. 286—7.

† Aclisie Gotice Sancte Anastasie.

‡ There is great uncertainty with regard to the meaning of this word. See Zahn's *Gothischen Sprachüberreste in Neapel und Arezzo* p. 48—53.

§ Zahn's *Ulphilas. Introd.* p. 76—7.

one Gothic. The original document was of the same age with the Title Deed at St. Annunciata, but it is no longer extant. We copy from Zahn the only Gothic attestation.

G. Ik guthilub^{*} dkn^{*} tho frabauhta boka fram mis
 L. Ego Gottlieb Diakonus haec vendidi librum a me
 gaw^{*}aurhta thus dkn^{*} alamoda fidwor unkjana hug^{*}ses kaballarja
 feci tibi Diakone Alamod quatuor uncias fundi caballaria
 jah killiggans 'RLG' and^{*}nahm jah ufmelida.
 et solidos 133 accepi et subscripsi.*

It will be seen that both the documents given above are imperfect. They are both written in a much more negligent and careless manner than the Codex Argenteus.

All else that remains of the Gothic language which has yet been discovered is extremely insignificant.†

Before we come to the consideration of the Gothic language, it will be necessary to digress a little from our path, and give some account of the Germanic languages, and their mutual connection.

The German or Teutonic languages may be divided into two great branches : viz., the Scandinavian, which includes the Icelandic, Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian languages and their various dialects ; and the German Proper, subdivided in turn into two classes, distinguished, the one by its harshness and fullness, and the other by its softness and flexibility. The rougher and more energetic of these tongues is called the Upper Germanic (Hoch-Deutsch) because spoken in the upper or mountainous parts of Germany ; while the other, the Lower Germanic, (Platt-Deutsch) the more euphonious, receives its name from being used in the low or flat parts of the same country. To the Upper belong the Gothic, Allemannic and Francic, now extinct, with the modern High German and its dialects. From the lower came the Anglo-Saxon, the Friesic, the Old Saxon, and through them, the English, the Dutch, the Flemish, and the present dialects of northern Germany. We have seen that the Ulphilanic version received the name of Moeso-Gothic from

* Zahn's Ulphilas. Introd. p. 78.

† There are also a few Gothic words found in the Visigothic and Ostrogothic Laws, and in the Gothic historians. Busbeck's Letters on the Goths in the Crimea likewise contain some Gothic words, and the beginning of a song. See Zahn. p. 78—80.

the settlement of Moesia by the Göths, and that this was the first specimen of Teutonic literature. From the date of this work, until the eighth century, nothing can be discovered bearing the stamp of the High-German. The MSS principally contained Slavish translations of the church Latin, formed not only on the Latin construction, but following also its inflection. The High-German dialects then in use, as we have mentioned, were the Allemannic or Suabian, and the Francic. The former was written by Kero, Rhabanus Maurus, Notker, etc: the latter by Isidore, and others. The Francic seems to occupy an intermediate space between the two classes of Germanic languages; but as its spirit rather resembles that of the High-German, it is ranked under its head. It will be seen, then, that there are no relics of the High-German languages for a space of three hundred years.

The most interesting of the Low German dialects, from the perfectness of its preservation, its literature, its connection with our native tongue, and its relation to the Moeso-Gothic, is the Anglo-Saxon. The earliest specimen of this language is found in the laws of Ethelbert, king of Kent, written about A. D. 600. Some writers however have awarded the palm of priority to the Poem of Beowulf, the Traveller's Song. But in the oldest MS. of it which is extant, there are allusions to a period subsequent to the year 600. In its original composition, it was probably much older; perhaps about A. D. 450, and a hundred years later than the Gothic version. Marshall's Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, was published with the Moeso-Gothic translation, by Junius, the northern philologist, who added to the work a glossary of both languages. His scholar, Hickes, followed in his steps, and confounded them together, in which error he was followed by Lye. But the Anglo-Saxon and Moeso-Gothic have no nearer relation, than the Greek and Latin, or Hebrew and Arabic, and it is surprising that a scholar of the acuteness of Junius should have treated of them as sister dialects. It was not until Rask published his Anglo-Saxon Grammar, that the proper connection between the two languages was understood, and the Anglo-Saxon torn from the shackles of the Latin, and given its proper place as a Low German dialect.

Before we come to the immediate consideration of the Moeso-Gothic, it may be well to premise that there is not enough remaining of that language to form an accurate grammar or lexicon. The literature too exists in the form of a literal transla-

tion, thereby forbidding the true spirit of the language to show itself untrammelled. In this respect the Anglo-Saxon is much more fortunate. For although a great part of its literature is found in translations, poetry, original prose, and paraphrase are extant to sufficiently display the more remarkable peculiarities of its idiom, as well as its richness and copiousness.

It has been generally supposed that the Moeso-Gothic was the prevalent High-German of the day. But there are strong reasons for doubting this. The remarkable difference between the Moeso-Gothic, and the oldest relic of the other High-German dialects,—a difference not merely to be accounted for by the supposed changes, and abbreviations which any language might undergo in the space of three hundred and fifty years—proves that the time when the High-German divided itself into dialects was far earlier than the days of Ulphilas. A comparison of the Lord's Prayer in Moeso-Gothic, and Allemannic of 720, will show the truth of our assertion.

Gothic. Atta* unsar, thu in himinam. Weihnai namo
Allemannic. Fatter unseer, thu pist in Himele. Wihi Namun
 thein. Quimai thiudinassus theins. Wairthai wilja theins, swe in
 deinan; Chweme Rihi din; Werde willo din, so in
 himina, jah ana airthai. Hlaif unsarana thana sinteinan gif uns
 Himile, sosa in Erdu; Proath unseer emezhič kip uns
 himmadaga. Jah aflet uns thatei skulans sijaima, swaswe jah weis
 hiutu; Oblaz uns sculdi unseero, so wir
 afletam thaim skulam unsaraim. Ja ni briggais uns in fraistubnjai.
 oblazen Skuldikem uns; Enti ni firletti unsih in Khorunka;
 Ah lausei uns af thamma ubilin.
 Uzz erlosi unsih fona Ubile.†

On the other hand it is asserted by some, that the Moeso-Gothic is a mixture of High and Low German, with some foreign, perhaps Thracian words.‡ Adelung and his supporters, acknowledged when they classed it under the head of High-German (Hoch-Deutsch) languages, that it was in many respects closely connected with the Low-German (Platt-Deutsch;) and the introduction of all strange words is accounted for by the

* *Fadur* is legitimate Gothic. See Castiglione's Ulphil. Goth. Vers. ad Corinth. Sec. p. VI. and 79.

† Adelung's Mithridates, Vol. II. p. 185 and 194.

‡ Encycl. Americana. Art. German Language.

supposed emigrations beyond the Baltic, and by the intercourse with the Suiones already there. In which case, as Count Castiglione remarks, it would follow that the Suio-Gothic approaches nearer to the Moeso-Gothic than any other Teutonic language, which does not happen. It was the opinion of Fulda, in which the Count concurs, that the Gothic did not obtain its foreign words from any German race, nor indeed that the Gothic belongs to any peculiar German dialect, inasmuch as it is impossible to decide to which class of languages it makes the nearest approach. And this he thinks may have happened in one of two ways. Either the Gothic, as the Latin afterwards, became the mother of many cognate languages, and although many words are lost, the present language is perceptible in each by numerous relics; or, on the contrary, the Gothic language may have been formed from the juncture of many Gothic tribes!*

There is still another theory opposed to both of the former ones, supported by Balbi, and others, who rank the Moeso-Gothic among the Scandinavian languages.† But Balbi, and the class of comparative philologists to which he belongs, have been contented to seek for mere verbal coincidences without taking into consideration the grammatical structure of a language. Yet, the most unphilosophical observer cannot fail to perceive that if the inflection and syntactical arrangement of two languages be wholly different, although the roots of their words be the same, they can claim no nearer relationship than that of issuing from the same stock at some remote age. If indeed the forms of words in the Moeso-Gothic place it under the head of the Scandinavian languages, (which we very much doubt,) a moment's comparison of the grammatical changes and the structure of sentences in the Moeso-Gothic, and any Scandinavian dialect will convince us that the genius of the one is widely different from that of the other.

What then is the Moeso-Gothic, and what are its relations to the other Teutonic languages?

From the unabbreviated form in which the language exists, we are inclined to think that it is much older than has been generally supposed. Why may it not have stood in the same relation to the spoken Gothic, as the Sanskrit to the spoken dialects

* Ulphil. Goth. Vera. ad Cor. II. Ded. p. iv—v.

† Atlas Ethnographique. Tab. XIII.

of India? In its grammatical inflections it stands aside from all the Germanic languages now known; it has a dual; and like the Scandinavian languages, a passive voice. The regularity, and indeed, the perfection, of its structure entitle it to a much higher regard than the Anglo-Saxon; and it is absurd to suppose that this order and beauty were obtained from a mixture of the dialects of all the Gothic tribes. Besides, no philological principles yet discovered can support an opinion thus contravening all known facts in the formation of languages. Who could have decided from what particular idiom the phrases to be employed should be selected? Ulphilas, certainly, could not have had the presumption to invent an alphabet, and then to make a language to suit: if he did, he was certainly the most successful of experimenters, and no wonder that his language is a puzzle to philologists!

The only position, then, with regard to the Moeso-Gothic, which seems in any degree tenable, is that of Count Castiglione; viz. that the Gothic was the parent of the Germanic languages. There is no word in the Gothic, which may not be found in some of the Teutonic, that is, Germanic and Scandinavian languages. It bears, too, evident marks of having flourished previous to the time when the Low and High German dialects arose—the peculiarities of enunciation, which distinguish these classes, are not observable—or at least they did not find their way into the Gothic writings, and not until the exact epoch is known when the Gothic was exclusively used throughout the North of Europe, can any calculation be made of the antiquity of these dialects.

But there can be no uncertainty with regard to the value of the Moeso-Gothic language as preserved in the code of Ulphilas. In the precision, multiplicity, and freedom of form both of conjugation and declension, it equals if it does not surpass the Greek: it bears an equal impress of antiquity,—its changes are equally regular—its facility of compounding is equally wonderful, having a formative power almost unappreciable except by a German scholar. The copiousness and richness of its vocabulary, with its remarkable capability for expressing nice shades of meaning, peculiarly adapted it to the purposes of translation. But we labor under a great disadvantage in possessing the Gothic only in the form of a translation, as it is impossible to judge so fully of the whole force of the language as an original composition would have placed it in our power. In a transla-

tion, violence is done both to the original and the language into which the translation is made. The multiplicity of synonymes, the taste and consistency of metaphor, and the varieties in the forms of phraseology, traits particularly showing the genius of a language, and always manifest in every original production, cannot be brought forward in the language into which the translation is made. Yet all this does not deteriorate from the worth of the Moeso-Gothic as a philosophic language. One of the most valuable links in the chain of Indo-Germanic languages, it develops important principles, and its value for grammatical reference cannot be too highly appreciated.

Very little has as yet been done towards the cultivation of this interesting language, and, indeed, many educated men are not aware of its existence in a separate form. In the general awakening which seems to be taking place throughout our land with regard to the northern languages, we hope that the Moeso-Gothic will receive its due share of attention. While the Anglo-Saxon, the mother of our own native tongue is cultivated, may her elder sister not be neglected!

ARTICLE IV.

INQUIRY RESPECTING THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL, AND THE GENUINENESS OF THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF THE SAME; WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO MR. NORTON'S VIEW OF THESE SUBJECTS AS EXHIBITED IN HIS TREATISE ON THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPELS.

By M. Stuart, Prof. Sac. Lit. Theol. Sem. Andover.

§ 7. *Introductory Remarks.*

In the preceding number of this Miscellany I have examined at length the position, that the Gospel of Matthew was originally written in *Hebrew*, and that our present canonical Matthew is only a Greek translation of the original. It is possible, indeed, that this position is true; but the sum of the evidence before us, when thoroughly examined, seems to render it highly improbable.

Mr. Norton, who rejects the first two chapters of our canonical Matthew because he deems them to be an interpolation, has prepared the way for the introduction of this opinion, by maintaining that the Original Gospel of Matthew was in Hebrew. He had his reasons for so doing. The state of the testimony before us, in regard to the two chapters in question, is such as makes the case desperate for those who impugn their genuineness, if the *Greek* Matthew is to be relied on as the source of evidence. This we shall see in the sequel. Consequently, if there be any room for suspicion as to the Genuineness of Matthew I. II., it must be sought for in the Hebrew editions of this Gospel. Now as the church has never heard any thing of these since about the beginning of the fifth century, excepting a few fragments that some of the fathers have preserved, conjecture has room apparently for a wide range; and at any rate it is freed from the danger of being overthrown by positive evidence drawn from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It is not until we come down to the times of Epiphanius, near the close of the fourth century, that we can find more than some four or five extracts from the Jewish Gospel, which enable us to form any decisive judgment as to its internal state or condition.

Mr. Norton uses very freely the liberty which this state of things seems to afford him. He tells us (p. liii.), that Matthew I. II. was at first a separate composition—an *Evangelium Infantiae* published by some curious inquirer into the early history of the Saviour; and that this, from its seemingly obvious congruity with the history of Jesus's public life as given us by Matthew, i. e. from its supplementary nature, was first written separately on the same Ms. with the Gospel, and finally incorporated with it. In that state the Greek translator found his Ms. or Mss. to be, and he rendered the whole into the Greek language, as belonging to one and the same author.

But what are the *facts* on which this very important deduction or proposition is built? Mr. Norton has not told us what they are; at least he has given us no *external* evidence whatever of a historical nature. No voice of antiquity is raised in favour of such an opinion. No hint of this kind any where appears. The two chapters under examination were indeed omitted, as Epiphanius avers, in the Gospel of the Ebionites. But instead of an intimation that there was any good reason for

omitting them, this father expressly calls such Gospel of theirs *νεροθευμένον καὶ ἡκρωτηριασμένον*, *adulterated and curtailed*.

Internal grounds of suspicion, however, are to be found in the chapters aforesaid, according to the views of Mr. Norton. It is on these, and on these only, that he builds his opinion. These, therefore, claim our attention; and in the sequel they must be examined. But before we come to this part of our task, it will be important to show the reader what the actual state of evidence is, in regard to the chapters before us. This I shall now endeavour to do.

§ 8. *Positive evidence establishing the genuineness of Matthew I. II.*

(1) *All Ms. copies of Matthew the world over, and all the ancient Versions without an exception, contain the first two chapters of Matthew, and exhibit them as part of his Gospel.*

The only exception to this remark is, that some two or three Mss. are defective, i. e. have perished, at the beginning of Matthew's Gospel. Thus the Codex Bezae or Cantab. wants the first twenty verses in Matthew, and Cod. Eschenbach. at Nürnberg has a like defect. Both unquestionably exhibited the genealogy in their original state.

The time was, in the days of Griesbach, when it was given out that the Codex Ebner. (Cod. 105 apud Wetstenium) did not contain the genealogy in Matthew. But this was a mistake; which was rectified by Gabler in his *Journal für Theol. Lit.*, 1801, part. 6. Schoenleben, who published a minute account of this Ms., gave occasion to this report by saying in his *Exposé*: 'Primum caput A his verbis incipit, τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος. It is true, indeed, that κεφάλαιον A., i. e. Chap. I., does so begin. But there is another truth respecting matters of this kind, which shows that there is not a particle of weight in the testimony derived from this, in favor of the omission of the two first chapters of Matthew, but the contrary. "All the books of the New Testament," says Griesbach (*Comm. Crit.* II. p. 49), "omit the numbering of the first paragraph in any book.... Thus, in all the Codices of Matthew which are furnished with τίτλοι [i. e. titles, short contents], κεφάλαιον A, or chap. I., begins with Matthew 2: 1, and is entitled περὶ τῶν Μάγων." So in Mark the first κεφάλαιον begins with Mark 1: 29; in Luke with 2: 1; in John with 2: 1; in the Epistle to

the Romans with 1: 18; and so of the rest. A matter of fact plain enough, indeed, but one which, if it had been earlier noticed, would have saved some critics not a little of empty declamation.

John Williams, who in 1789 published a second edition of his *Free Inquiry into the Authenticity of the first and second Chapters of Matthew's Gospel*, boldly avers that some of the old *Latin* Codices omit these chapters. It turns out, on investigation, to be nothing more than that some Codices place the genealogy by itself, as a kind of preface to the whole work. Thus the Codex Harleianus, written perhaps in the seventh century, at the end of Matt. 1: 17, contains the following words inserted by the copyist: *Genealogia hucusque*. Then, as a heading to the sequel, he adds: *Incipit Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*. Doubtless these notices were taken into the body of the work, from the margin of some older copy. They are evidently notes which are essentially *marginal* in their very nature.

A few other Latin Codices, mostly written in Ireland during the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, in like manner arrange the genealogy in the way of a proem, after which they introduce *titular* matter before verse 18th of Matt. I., which commences the regular narration. But all this shows nothing more than the hand of some critical redactor, who wished the reader to make a distinction between a genealogical table of names, and what might be appropriately named the *Gospel* or *History of Jesus*.

Other Latin Codices older and better, all the Syriac, Coptic, and other versions, in all their copies, and finally all the Greek copies without any variation, exhibit the chapters in question.

So far then as it respects any evidence actually in being, either from Mss. or Versions, there is not one copy of either upon the face of the whole earth, which is known to be wanting as to Matthew I. II.

The case then is absolutely desperate, on critical ground. We may *conjecture* what we please, I admit; but conjecture can never stand in the place of plain and palpable facts, when the discussion turns upon a point of lower criticism. To the Mss., and to the Versions—is the answer always to be made to every inquiry of this nature. *Conjecture* is allowable only where these fail us.

We might stop here, then, and consider the discussion as at

an end. We might lawfully do so. But, as Jerome sometimes says, in a dispute, that he will do this or that *ex abundanti*, in order that nothing may be omitted which the nature of the case will enable him to bring forward; so, in the present case, I will adduce other evidence to confirm more completely what is already substantially proved.

(2) *The two first chapters of Matthew have always belonged to his Greek Gospel, (and no other genuine Gospel, as we have seen, can be rendered probable), ever since it came into circulation.*

I will not occupy the time of the reader in making quotations to prove this, from Jerome, Augustine, Epiphanius, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, nor even Irenaeus and Tertullian. No one who has any candour and any tolerable acquaintance with these writers, and with others who were their contemporaries, will venture to deny or even to doubt, that they have quoted and often quoted the two first chapters of Matthew as a part of his Gospel.

I advance at once, therefore, to Justin Martyr, who brings us close upon the confines of the apostolic age.

Mr. Norton has laboured, and very much to the purpose, to show that Justin quoted our canonical Gospels. I aver, that he has quoted Matthew I. II., in such a way as to make it certain, that the Gospel of Matthew in his hands was the same with that which we now have. My proof of this is an exhibition of his quotations; which are arranged as found in Credner's *Beiträge*, p. 151 seq.

Dial. c. Tryph. 100. p. 195.

Matt. 1: 1—17.

Γινόντες αὐτὸν [τὸν Χριστὸν] πρωτότοκον μὲν τοῦ
θεοῦ, καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων, καὶ τῶν
πατριαρχῶν υἱόν, ἐπειδὴ διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ γέ-
νους αὐτῶν παρθένου σαρκοποιηθεὶς. —
— υἱὸν οὖν ἀνθρώπου ἐαυτὸν ἔλεγεν, ἥτοι
ἀπὸ τῆς γεννήσεως τῆς διὰ παρθένου,
ἣτις ἦν, ὡς ἔφην, ἀπὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ, καὶ Ἰακώβ,
καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἀβραὰμ γένους· ἡ διὰ τὸ εἶναι
αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀβραὰμ πατέρα καὶ τούτων τῶν κα-
τηριθμημένων, ἐξ ὧν κατὰ γὰρ ἡ Μαρία
τὸ γένος. Καὶ γὰρ πατέρας τῶν γεννωμένων ταῖς θυ-
γατράσιν αὐτῶν τέκνων τοὺς τῶν θηλειῶν γεννήτο-
ρας ἐπιστάμεθα.

Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ,
υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ.
Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέννησε τὸν
Ἰσαὰκ· Ἰσαὰκ δὲ —
— Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησε
τὸν Ἰωσήφ, τὸν ἄν-
δρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς
ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς.

Dial. c. Tr. 43. p. 139.

— — εἰς τὸν, διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, καὶ Δαβὶδ παρθένου, γεννηθέντα υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστόν. Comp. Ib. 45. p. 141.

Dial. c. Tr. 120. p. 212 seq.

Λίγου (ὁ Θεός) τῷ Ἰσαάκ· (Genea. 22: 18) καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς. τῷ δὲ Ἰακώβ· (Genea. 28: 14) καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου· οὐκ ἐστὶ τοῦτο τῷ Ἠσαΐ, οὐδὲ τῷ Ρουβὶμ λέγει, οὐδὲ ἄλλῳ τινὶ, ἀλλ' ἐκείνοις ἐξ ὧν ἔμελλεν ἔσεσθαι κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν, τὴν διὰ τῆς παρθένου Μαρίας, ὁ Χριστός. Εἶπε καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν Ἰούδα (Genea. 49: 10) καταμάθοις, ἴδοις ἄν, ὃ λέγω· μερίζεται γὰρ τὸ σπέρμα ἐξ Ἰακώβ, καὶ διὰ Ἰούδα, καὶ Φαρές, καὶ Ἰεσσαὶ, καὶ Δαβὶδ κατέρχεται.

Apol. I. 33. p. 64.

(Comp. Dial. 66, 163. 63, 160. 85, 181. Apol. I. 63, 82. etc.)

Ὡς ἀντολέξει διὰ παρθένου μὲν τεχ-
θησόμενος διὰ τοῦ Ἠσαΐου (7: 14)
προφητεύθη, ἀκούσατε. Ἐλέχθη
δὲ οὕτως·

Ἰδοὺ, ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει,
καὶ τέξεται υἱόν· καὶ ἐροῦσιν ἐπὶ
τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ
Θεός.

Apol. I. 33. p. 64.

Καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰη-
σοῦν· αὐτός γάρ σώσει τὸν λαόν
αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

Apol. I. 34. p. 65.

Ὅπου δὲ καὶ τῆς γῆς γεννᾶσθαι
ἔμελλεν, ὡς προεῖπεν ἕτερος προφήτης
ὁ Μιχαίας, ἀκούσατε, ἔφη δὲ οὕτως·
(5: 2) Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα,
οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμό-
σιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται
ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν
μου.

Matth. I. II.

Matth. 1: 22. ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ φη-
θέν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφή-
του λέγοντος·

Ἰδοὺ, ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει,
καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ
ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ· ὃ ἐστὶ [με-
θερμηνευόμενον], μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός.

Matth. 1: 21.

Καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰη-
σοῦν· αὐτός γάρ σώσει τὸν λαόν
αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

Matth. 2: 5, 6.

Οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προ-
φήτου· Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα,
οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμό-
σιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται
ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν
μου, τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

Dial. c. Tr. 77, 78. p. 174 seq.

Ἄμα τῷ γεννηθῆναι αὐτόν, μάγοι ἀπὸ Ἀρράβιας παραγε-
νόμενοι προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, πρότε-
ρον ἐλθόντες πρὸς Ἡρώδην,
τὸν ἐν τῇ γῇ ὑμῶν τότε βασιλεύ-
οντα. — Οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης,
μαθὼν παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ
λαοῦ ὑμῶν, τότε ἐλθόντων πρὸς αὐ-
τὸν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀρράβιας μάγων
καὶ εἰπόντων· ἐξ ἀστέρος τοῦ ἐν
τῷ οὐρανῷ φανέντος ἐγνωκέναι,
ὅτι βασιλεὺς γεγέννηται ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ
ὑμῶν, καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐ-
τόν. [Comp. Dial. c. Tr. 106. p.
201. Ἀνατείλλαντος οὖν καὶ ἐν
οὐρανῷ ἅμα τῷ γεννηθῆ-
ναι αὐτόν ἀστέρος, ὡς γέ-
γραπται ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονείμασιν
τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ, οἱ ἀπὸ
Ἀρράβιας μάγοι ἐκ τούτου ἐπι-
γινώσκοντες, παρεγένοντο καὶ προσεκύ-
νησαν αὐτῷ.] καὶ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῶν
πρεσβυτέρων εἰπόντων, ὅτι γέγραπ-
ται ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ οὕτως· (Micah
5: 2.) “Καὶ σὺ Βηθλεὲμ γῆ Ἰούδα,
οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἰ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμό-
σιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται
ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν
μου.” Τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀρράβιας οὖν
μάγων ἐλθόντων εἰς Βηθλεὲμ, καὶ
προσκυνησάντων τὸ παιδίον, καὶ
προσευγκάντων αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσὸν
καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν· ἐπειδὴ
κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, μετὰ τὸ
προσκυνῆσαι τὸν παῖδα ἐν Βηθλεὲμ
ἐκελεύσθησαν μὴ ἐπανελθεῖν πρὸς
τὸν Ἡρώδην· καὶ Ἰωσήφ δὲ, ὁ τὴν
Μαρίαν μεμνηστευμένος, βουλή-
θεις πρότερον ἐκβαλεῖν τὴν
μνηστὴν αὐτῷ Μαριὰμ, νο-
μίζων ἐγκυμονεῖν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ συνου-
σίας ἀνδρός, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀπὸ πορ-
νείας, δι' ὁράματος κατέλευστο
ἐκβαλεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,

Vol. XII. No. 32.

Matt. 2: 1—13.

2: 1. Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν
Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἰδοὺ, μάγοι
ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παρεγένοντο. — 2:
3. Ἀκούσας δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς
ἐταράχθη.

2: 4. Καὶ συναγαγὼν πάντας τοὺς
ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ,
ἐπυνθάνετο παρ' αὐτῶν, ποῦ ὁ Χρι-
στὸς γεννᾶται.

2: 1, 2. μάγοι — λέγοντες· ποῦ

ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰου-
δαίων; εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀσ-
τέρα ἐν ἀνατολῇ, καὶ ἦλθομεν προσ-
κυνῆσαι αὐτῷ.

2: 5. Οἱ δὲ (ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμμα-
τεῖς) εἶπον αὐτῷ· Ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς
Ἰουδαίας· οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ
τοῦ προφήτου· Καὶ σὺ Βηθλ. κ. τ. λ.

2: 11, 12. Καὶ ἐλθόντες (οἱ μάγοι)
εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, εἶδον τὸ παιδίον με-
τὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ· καὶ
πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ· καὶ
ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς θησαυροὺς αὐτῶν
προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσὸν, καὶ
λίβανον, καὶ σμύρναν. Καὶ χρημα-
τισθέντες κατ' ὄναρ, μὴ ἀνακάμψαι
πρὸς Ἡρώδην, δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ ἀνε-
χώρησαν εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν.—
Matt. 1: 18 seq. Μνηστευθείσης γὰρ
τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰω-
σήφ, [πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς] εὐ-
ρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύμα-
τος ἁγίου. Ἰωσήφ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐ-
τῆς, δίκαιος ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων

41

εἰπόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ φανέντος ἁγγε-
λου, ὅτι ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου
ὃ ἔχει κατὰ γαστρός ἐστίν.

Φοβηθεὶς οὖν, οὐκ ἐκβέβληκεν
αὐτήν.

Dial. c. Tr. 78. p. 175.

Καὶ αὐτός (ὁ Ἰωσήφ) ἅμα τῇ Μα-
ρίᾳ κελεύεται ἐξελθεῖν εἰς Αἴγυπτον,
καὶ εἶναι ἐκεῖ ἅμα τῷ παιδίῳ, ἄχρις
ἂν αὐτοῖς πάλιν ἀποκαλυφθῇ ἐπα-
νελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν.

Dial. c. Tr. 78. p. 175.

Καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης μὴ ἐπανελθόντων
πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀφράβιας
μάγων, ὥς ἠξίωσεν αὐτοὺς ποιῆσαι,
ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα αὐτοῖς
δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐ-
τῶν ἀπυλλαγόντων, καὶ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ
ἅμα τῇ Μαρίᾳ καὶ τῷ παιδίῳ, ὥς
καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀποκεκάλυπτο, ἤδη ἐξελ-
θόντων εἰς Αἴγυπτον, οὐ γινώσκων
τὸν παῖδα, ὃν ἐληλύθεισαν προσκυ-
νῆσαι οἱ μάγοι, πάντας ἅπλως
τοῦς παῖδας, τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ,
ἐκέλευσεν ἀναιρεθῆναι· καὶ τοῦτο
ἐπεπροφητεύτο μέλλειν γίνεσθαι διὰ
Ἰερεμίου, εἰπόντος δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ
ἁγίου πνεύματος οὕτως· (31: 15.)
“Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἠκούσθη, κλαυθ-
μὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολὺς· Ῥαχὴλ
κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐκ
ἤθελε παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν.”

Dial. c. Tr. 82. p. 185.

Μαρτύριον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἔστω ὑμῖν, ὃ ἔφην πρὸς ὑμᾶς γεγονέναι ὑπὸ τῶν
Ἀφράβιας μάγων, οἵτινες ἅμα τῷ γεννηθῆναι τὸ παιδι-
ον, ἐλθόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.

αὐτήν παραδειγματίσαι,
ἐβουλήθη λάθρα ἀπολύσαι αὐτήν.
Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος, ἰδοὶ,
ἄγγελος κυρίου κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη
αὐτῷ λέγων· Ἰωσήφ, υἱὸς Δαβὶδ,
μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαν
τὴν γυναῖκά σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ
γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου.
Matt. 1: 24. Διεγερθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰω-
σήφ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου ἐποίησεν, ὥς
προσέταξεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου,
καὶ παρέλαβε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

Matt. 2: 13.

— ἰδού, ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται
κατ' ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ, λέγων· ἐγερ-
θεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν
μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπ-
τον, καὶ ἴσθι ἐκεῖ, ἕως ἂν εἶπω σοί.

Matt. 2: 16—18.

Τότε Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν, ὅτι ἐνεπαίχθη
ὑπὸ τῶν μάγων, ἐθυμώθη λίαν·
καὶ ἀποστείλας ἀνέειλε πάντας τοὺς
παῖδας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι
τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῆς, ἀπὸ διετοῖς καὶ
κατωτέρω, κατὰ τὸν χρόνον, ὃν ἠκρί-
βωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων.

Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερε-
μίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος· φω-
νὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἠκούσθη, θρήνος καὶ
κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολὺς· Ῥα-
χὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς, καὶ
οὐκ ἤθελε παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ
εἰσὶν.

Dial. c. Tr. 102. p. 196.

“*Ἀμα γὰρ τῷ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν Βηθλεὲμ, ὡς προέφη, παρὰ τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀρράβιας μάγων μαθὼν Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰ κατ’ αὐτὸν, ἐπεβούλευσεν ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν· καὶ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κέλευσιν Ἰωσήφ λαβὼν αὐτὸν ἅμα τῇ Μαρίᾳ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον.*”

Dial. c. Tr. 103. p. 198.

Matt. 2: 19—23.

— κακεῖ (ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ) ἦσαν ἀπελθόντες ἄχρις αὐτῶν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀποκτείνων τὰ ἐν Βηθλεὲμ παῖδια Ἡρώδης, καὶ Ἀρχέλαος αὐτὸν διεδέξατο· καὶ οὗτος ἐτελείτα πρὶν τὸν Χριστὸν τὴν οἰκονομίαν, τὴν κατὰ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένην ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρωθῆναι ἐλθεῖν.

Τελευτήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἡρώδου, ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος κυρίου κατ’ ὄναρ φαίνεται τῷ Ἰωσήφ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, λέγων· ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορεύου εἰς γῆν Ἰσραὴλ· τεθνήκασι γὰρ οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου. Ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς παρέλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς

γῆν Ἰσραὴλ. Ἀκούσας δὲ, ὅτι Ἀρχέλαος βασιλεύει ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀντὶ Ἡρώδου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐφοβήθη ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν· χρηματισθεὶς δὲ κατ’ ὄναρ, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς Γαλιλαίας. Καὶ ἐλθὼν κατώκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ.

If there can be any doubt in the mind of any reader who is able to make and does carefully make the comparison of Matthew with Justin, whether the latter has cited the Evangelist in the cases here exhibited, it would seem to me truly strange. But that the matter may be made clearer still, let it be noted, that in the citations from the Old Testament, where Matthew differs both from the Septuagint and from the Hebrew, having probably made his own free translation, Justin has followed the Evangelist. E. g. in Matt. 1 : 23, cited from Is. 7 : 14, the Sept. has *ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται*, but Matthew, and after him Justin, use the phrase *ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει*. The Hebrew has *תקרי* and *she shall call*; the Sept. *καλέσεις, thou shalt call*; but Matthew has *καλέσουσι, they shall call*. Justin says *ἐροῦσιν*, using the third person plural (although of another synonymous verb), just as Matthew had done.

Observe again, in the quotation, Matt. 2: 5, 6, where the Evangelist agrees neither with the Septuagint nor with the Hebrew, Justin follows him *verbatim* throughout. The Septuagint runs thus : “Thou Bethlehem, house of Ephratah, art very small to be among the thousands of Judah; from thee shall go forth for me [one] who shall be a ruler of Israel.” The Hebrew runs thus : “And thou Bethlehem Ephratah art small to

be among the thousands of Judah ; from thee shall go forth for me [one] who shall rule in Israel."

In Matthew 2: 18, where a quotation is made from Jer. 31: 15, it will be seen by comparison that Justin's quotation is *verbatim*, with the exception that *θρήνος* is omitted, which has probably fallen from Justin's text. But the Septuagint has here *φωνή ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἀκούσθη θρήνου, καὶ κλαυθμοῦ, καὶ ὀδυρμοῦ, Ῥαχὴλ ἀποκλαιομένη οὐκ ἤθελε παύσασθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῆς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ* which is a mode of construction quite different from that in Matthew. The Hebrew original runs thus : " A voice in Ramah was heard, wailing, bitter lamentation ; Rachel, weeping for her children, refuses to be comforted respecting her children, because they are not."

Such a harmony of Justin with these *minutiae* of the two first chapters of Matthew, and in respect to passages from the Old Testament, where the Septuagint Version afforded the greatest facility for the Greek quotation and yet is not adopted, prove beyond all reasonable controversy, not only that Justin has quoted the Gospel of Matthew, but quoted our canonical Greek Gospel ; and not this only as to some of the leading parts of it, but the peculiarities of chapters I. II. even in their nicest shades, are preserved by Justin. Indeed Mr. Norton himself feels compelled to concede, that our Greek Matthew, even in chapters I. II. is quoted by Justin ; see p. 228 of his work. If any reader has doubted of this, the view given him above must, as I think, remove all those doubts.

It is a remarkable circumstance, too, that nearly every important thing which is related in the first two chapters of Matthew, is referred to or actually quoted by Justin ; so that we have not merely some general and indistinct evidence, but testimony minute and circumstantial ; and consequently there is no room for reasonable doubt or hesitation as to Justin's having before him our canonical Matthew.

I might add other testimony of a similar nature, which is very little later than that of Justin. Celsus, the celebrated heathen philosopher and bitter enemy of Christians, flourished about 150. He wrote a learned and powerful work against Christianity, which Origen afterwards answered in his famous treatise *Contra Celsum*. In that Treatise, Origen has quoted largely from Celsus ; and among other quotations, he has given us several passages which shew with entire certainty that our canonical Matthew was in the hands of Celsus, and was read by him as

the Christian account of the life and actions of Jesus. Nothing can be more certain than that the copy which Celsus read, contained Matthew I. II.; for the quotations from him by Origen make this plain. Let me present a few of them to the reader, for his entire satisfaction in this matter.

Orig. cont. Cels. II. 32, "Nimis insolenter ait [Celsus] τοὺς γενεαλογήσαντας τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου φύντος [sc. Adamo, Luke III], καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ βασιλέων." [Matt. I.]

Ib. I. 66, Celsus is represented as thus addressing Jesus: τί σε νήπιον εἶτι ἔχρην εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐκκομίζεσθαι; . . . ἄγγελος μὲν ἦκεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, κελεύων σοι καὶ τοῖς οἰκέλοις θύγειν comp. Matt. 2: 13. Again: "Deus δύο ἤδη διὰ σε ἀγγέλους miserat;" comp. Matt. 1: 20. 2: 12.

In V. 58 ib. Origen testifies that Celsus had mentioned τὸ περὶ τῆς Μαρίας κυούσης ἐληλυθέναι πρὸς τὸν Ἰωσήφ ἄγγελον [Matt. 1: 20], καὶ πάλιν, ὑπερ τοῦ τὸ βρέφος γεννηθὲν καὶ ἐπιβουλευόμενον ἐξαρπάσαντας θύγειν εἰς Αἴγυπτον [Matt. 2: 13].

In I. 34 of the same work, Origen says that Celsus had mentioned many things in the Gospel of Matthew; e. g. τὸν ἀνατείλαντα ἀστέρα ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, [Matt. 2: 2].

In I. 58 Origen says of Celsus: Χαλδαίους, φησὶν, ὑπὸ τοῦ λελέχθαι κινήθειας ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει αὐτοῦ ἐληλυθέναι, προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν, εἶτι νήπιον, ὡς θεόν [Matt. 2: 11], καὶ Ἡρώδη τῷ τειράρχῃ τοῦτο δεδηλωκέναι [Matt. 2: 3], τόνδε πέμψαντα ἀποκτεῖναι τοὺς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ γεγεννημένους [Matt. 2: 16.]

More might be added; but these references to Matthew I. II. are so plain and indisputable that not a shadow of doubt can remain, that Celsus, about the middle of the second century, repeatedly quoted the first two chapters of Matthew as confessedly and avowedly a part of Gospel History.

Nor is there a quotation taken from the Gospel in question, among all the ancient fathers, from the apostolic ones downwards, the authority of which is plainly and simply avowed or implied, which does not come from our canonical Matthew. The use of any other Gospel in the church catholic is out of question. At all events, the earliest information we have, gives us no reason to believe that any other was ever used by the church at large.

The same evidence, moreover, which we have of the existence of a Greek Matthew, and of its being used by the early churches, we also have of the first two chapters of the same, as constituting a component part of the Greek Matthew.

Our *positive* external evidence, then, is as complete of the early existence and authenticity of this part of Matthew, as it is of the rest of his Gospel, or of any other Gospel which is contained in our Canon.

One circumstance more, however, should be here added ; not because our proof actually needs any aid from it, but in order to shew how much testimony may easily be combined to establish the point which I am labouring to establish.

The Peshito or old Syriac Version of the New Testament, has already been mentioned, in my dissertation on the original language of Matthew's Gospel, published in the preceding number of this Miscellany. We have seen that this Version was in all probability made within the first half of the second century ; and therefore that it was made about the time when Justin Martyr and Celsus wrote the works from which I have made so many quotations in the preceding pages. We have also seen, that Matthew I. II. is not only translated into the Syriac, but that the translator must have had the same text, *verbatim and literatim*, which now stands in our canonical Greek Matthew. Every *καί, δέ, οὐν*, or other particle, is scrupulously rendered ; and the passage which gives offence to such critics as Kuinoel—"which being interpreted is *God with us*"—stands in the Peshito, exactly in accordance with our present canonical Matthew.

Let us look now at the nature of the case before us. Here, in the very next generation, or nearly so, after the apostolic age, is a writer (Justin Martyr) in the midst of Ebionites and Nazarenes, living at Flavia Neapolis in Samaria, and appealing to and citing our canonical *Greek* Matthew ; and not only this, but particularly Matthew I. II. About the same period a heathen philosopher, probably an Epicuraean, a strenuous and contemptuous enemy of Christianity, in his attack upon this religion appeals to our canonical Matthew, and oftentimes to chap. I. II. Not improbably this infidel writer composed his work in Egypt. Then, in the next place, we have a translation of the New Testament Scriptures, made about the same time in Syria, probably in the remoter part of it, at Edessa, of which it is certain that our canonical Greek Matthew was the basis, and beyond all doubt that chapters I. II. were translated from the identical text which we now have.

Nor is even this all the early external evidence which may be produced. Cerinthus was a *Jewish* heretic, of the Gnostic

cast, in the first century, and he lived but a few years after the Gospel of Matthew was composed (fl. 80). That he was a *Palestine Jew*, Paulus has rendered altogether probable, in his *Historia Cerinthi*, contained in his *Introduct. in Nov. Testament. Capita selectiora*, and Schmidt in his *Bibl. für Kritik und Exegese des N. Test. B. I. S. 181, Cerinth ein Judaisirender Christ*. That he and Carpocrates made use of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, is expressly asserted by Epiphanius (*Haeres. XXX. 13*), who says: "Cerinthus and Carpocrates, using the same Gospel with them [the Ebionites], endeavours to shew *from the genealogy at the beginning of the Gospel κατὰ Ματθαῖον*, that Christ sprung from the seed of Joseph and Mary. But they [the Ebionites] cutting off the genealogy in Matthew, begin their Gospel as I said before, viz., *Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου Βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας*, etc." By the *same Gospel* Epiphanius evidently means here *the Gospel in Hebrew*. This Gospel the Ebionites received, but they curtailed it by omitting the first two chapters; while Cerinthus and Carpocrates laboured to prove, from these very chapters, in their Hebrew copies, the merely natural and human origin of the Saviour.

So then we go back here to the very age of the apostles, and find Jews at that period using a *Hebrew Gospel*, which contains the chapters whose genuineness is now called in question.

Evidence simultaneous, from so many different quarters and in such a variety of ways, cannot be resisted. It is certain that in the next generation after the apostles, our canonical Matthew was the only authentic one to which the church catholic made appeal; and equally certain, that chapters I. II. constituted the same portion of it which they now do.

Such is the state of *external* evidence, that Matthew I. II. is genuine and contemporaneous with the whole book. In justice to the subject, however, it should not be dismissed, until we inquire whether there is any *internal* evidence which will serve to corroborate the testimony already exhibited. My answer to this inquiry is, that there are some phenomena in chap. III., which seem to be unaccountable in case the Gospel of Matthew originally began with the third chapter.

First the *δέ* in Matt. 3: 1 is deserving of special note. A perfectly clear case it is, that a book could not commence with a *δέ* in the first clause, inasmuch as *δέ* is such a *connective* particle as necessarily implies something *antecedent* in the discourse.

But if chapters I. II. did not originally belong to this Gospel, then there was in this case no antecedent.

I am aware that not a few Mss., and some of good authority, omit the *δέ* here ; and so, also, several of the Versions. But, as Griesbach remarks (Comm. Crit. p. 23), ‘no good reason can be given why *δέ* should be *added*, [to the text]. On the other hand, as this verse was the beginning of a κεφάλαιον, or of an ἀνάγνωσμα (*lection*), there is a very plain reason for its *omission* [in Lectionaries], specially as the matter which follows is very discrepant from that which precedes.’ Hence Griesbach, concludes, respecting the particle in question, that “rectius retinetur.” But if retained, it argues the necessity of precedent matter ; i. e. the Gospel could not have begun here ; and so the existence of chapters I. II., or at any rate of some matter of this kind, is of necessity implied.

I am aware that the usual answer to all this has been and still is, that the *translator* into Greek added the *δέ*, in order to keep up the connection between the two narratives, viz. that which precedes and that which follows. But why he needed to do this, cannot be well shewn. So great a transition would appear even to more advantage, so far as grammar or rhetoric is concerned, without the *δέ* than with it. And after all, it is a mere assumption, when one says that it was added by a translator. The Old Syriac translator, at any rate, found the *δέ* in the copy from which he made his version.

But dismissing this, let us see if there be not something more in the text here, which is deserving of particular notice.

What can be meant by ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ? “*Those days*” must necessarily refer to some days which had been already mentioned or alluded to. But if the first two chapters are not genuine, there is of course no such mention or allusion.

The Ebionite Gospel, which rejected these two chapters, instead of ἐκείναις, adds Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας. But what an emendation ! *In the days of Herod*, who had been dead some twenty-eight years !

Nor is the appeal to Ex. 2: 11 for an analogical case, at all in point. Ex. 2: 11 runs thus : “It came to pass, *in those days*, when Moses was grown.” The preceding verse (v. 10) says : “The child [Moses] grew ; and she [his mother] brought him unto Pharaoh’s daughter, and he became her son, etc.” Now *those days*, in v. 11, may refer either to the period mentioned here, or to what is expressed in the phrase immediately sub-

joined in v. 11. viz. *when Moses was grown*, which seems to be added for the sake of explaining what *those days* mean.

Nor can *those days* in Matt. 3: 1, be satisfactorily explained, by merely calling the phrase a *Hebraism*. True it is, that the Hebrews were accustomed thus to designate time. But in all cases, where *הַיָּמִים*, *those*, is employed with *יָמִים*, the context shews the nature and object of reference.

There is another expression in chapter III. which would seem to be very strange, in case chapters I. II. were not originally integral parts of Matthew's Gospel. I refer to v. 13, where it is said: "Then cometh Jesus *from Galilee*." Now if chap. I. II. are removed, there is no mention whatever of Jesus, nor of the place of his abode, previous to this declaration. Would it not be passing strange for a writer thus to introduce a most important personage wholly unknown to the reader, and thus to mention his place of abode, just as if it were already familiar to the reader? How can we account for a manner so abrupt, and such declarations without the least preparation for them?

On the other hand; supposing the first two chapters of Matthew to be genuine, we can easily explain all these expressions. *Δέ* connects chap. III. with the preceding history. *Ἐν ἡμέραις ἐκείναις* refers to what is said at the close of chap. II., viz., that Jesus came, with Joseph and Mary, and dwelt at Nazareth, and that *during his abode there* John the Baptist entered upon his public ministry. That Jesus "came from Galilee," 3: 13, is explained by 2: 22, where it is said that Joseph and Mary 'went to sojourn in the region of Galilee.'

That there is a large interval of time between the occurrences narrated in chap. II. and those in chap. III., is true enough. But as the writer had no intention of developing the *private* life of Jesus, the nature of the case required, that he should make a transition to the period of his public ministry. Transitions as great as these, are not unfrequent; specially in the prophetic parts of the Old Testament.

Let the reader now put all these *facts* together, and then ask himself, whether there is any probability that the two first chapters of Matthew are spurious? The external and internal evidence is certainly very strong in favour of the position, that they came from the hand of Matthew, the author of the whole book.

§ 9. *Examination of Objections.*

(1) 'The Gospel of the Ebionites did not contain Matt. I. II.'

So Epiphanius declares; and very probably he has told us the truth. But then we have the same authority to prove, that the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes, and also that of Cerinthus, did contain these chapters. Jerome who translated the Nazarene Gospel, never intimates any deficiency here; which he surely would have done, had it been found in his copy.

Besides, we have a solution of this difficulty in the fact, that the Ebionites rejected the miraculous conception of Jesus. This led them to do the same thing, which the Manichaeans afterwards did for another reason drawn from their theology or philosophy, viz., to reject that portion of Matthew which disagreed with their speculations. So Marcion did, in respect to the Gospel of Luke; so some of the Romish church afterwards did with respect to the epistle to the Hebrews, in their disputes against the Montanists, who appealed to that epistle in order to shew that lapsed Christians could not be restored again to repentance; and so the Anti-millenarians did, at a later period, when they rejected the Apocalypse. So even Luther did, in respect to the epistle of James, when he disputed with the Romanists about the doctrine of justification by faith alone. There is no end of such subterfuges among men of ardent temperament, or of bigoted feelings in respect to particular sectarian points of doctrine. How could Mr. Norton say, (p. liv), that "he can perceive nothing in the prejudices or habits of mind [of the Ebionites] which led them to reject the facts [related in Matt. I. II.?]"]

All this, however, proves nothing except the strength of prejudice in a particular party among early Christians. Even the Hebrew Gospel of primitive times was mutilated, as we have seen, only by one small party; and the authority of this party can weigh but little indeed, in a matter like the present, where so much direct and positive testimony lies before us which is against them.

At all events, as Griesbach well remarks, (Comm. Crit. II. p. 52), 'nothing can be proved by the hints we have respecting the state of the Ebionite Gospel, until it shall be shown more clearly what relation this Gospel sustained toward our canonical Matthew, so that we can reason from the state of the former to that of the latter.'

The manner in which the Gospel of the Ebionites *commences*, shews what sort of a compilation it was : “ It came to pass in the days of Herod, the King of Judea, that John came, baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan, etc.” So it is quoted in Epiphan. Haeres. XXX. 13 ; but in Haeres. XXX. 14, he gives us another beginning of this same Gospel : “ It came to pass in the days of Herod, King of Judea, while Caiphas was high priest, there came a certain John, by name, baptizing with the baptism of repentance, etc.” Here Luke 3: 2, respecting the high-priesthood of Caiphas, is intermingled with the text. In both, the wretched mistake is made of Herod being *King of Judea*, when John entered on his public ministry. Herod, the King of Judea, died the year after the birth of the Saviour, i. e. some twenty-eight years before John’s public appearance, and after him there was indeed a Herod who was a *tetrarch*, but no Herod who was a *king*, as here quoted.

Shall we resort, now, to such a Gospel as this, for establishing the interpolation of Matt. I. II. ? I trust not.

(2) ‘ The *Protevangelium* from which three of the Evangelists composed their narrations, did not probably contain Matt. I. II.’

Supposing now I should aver, that it did probably contain these chapters ; my assertion would be just as good as the opposite one. Of the *Protevangelium* no ancient writer of the church ever spoke, heard, or dreamed. It is a phenomenon of Neology alone, first dreamed, I believe, among countless other like visions, by the great heresiarch Semler ; and after him by others, whose imaginations were as lively as his ; finally, however, dreamed even on English ground, and by a man who is now a bishop ; but, last of all, scattered, as dreams are at the opening day, by an American at Cambridge, who has, one would think, so completely dissipated it that it will not soon make its appearance again.

(3) ‘ Mark begins his Gospel without any preface which relates the history of Jesus’ infancy ; and so Matthew probably began his, for Mark, who is the *epitomator* of Matthew, has not given us a word of the Gospel of the Infancy.’

Nor has he given us any of the Sermon on the Mount ; nor of many other things contained in Matthew. Are these therefore to be rejected as spurious ?

Besides ; there is no satisfactory evidence that Mark copied

Matthew at all. Mr. Norton has completely overthrown this position, in his work. And if he had not, the improbability of the thing is so great, when all the circumstances are taken into view, that almost no one now pretends to believe in such an allegation.

Moreover, John gives us nothing of the Gospel of the Infancy. Is Matthew, therefore, to be judged of by a comparison with him?

(4) 'Luke has given us a Gospel of the Infancy, which is not only different in all respects from that of Matthew, but in some respects is scarcely to be reconciled with it.'

But the fact that Luke has composed a Gospel of the Infancy, shows that such a thing might be done, and that it was done; and why could not Matthew as well compose one as Luke? As to the fact that his history differs from that of Matthew, is this any good reason for rejecting that of the latter? Does Luke give the same account of the Sermon on the Mount, as Matthew? Does he minutely accord with him in the relation of a great many transactions, and particularly those respecting the trial, condemnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of the Saviour? Every one knows the answer to these questions, who has made the comparison.

Another thing also is equally clear to a candid reader of both histories; viz. that there is nothing in Matthew which gainsays in the least what is set forth by Luke. On the contrary, the substantial fact, viz. the miraculous conception of the Saviour, is fully portrayed by both Evangelists.

(5) 'But there are internal difficulties, improbabilities, and at least seeming contradictions with other Evangelists, contained in Matt. I. II.'

On these Mr. Norton, and some others of his opinion, seem mainly to rely; for most of the objections already examined do not belong to Mr. Norton, but to other earlier writers. Let us now consider, then, the arguments which Mr. Norton specifically alleges in favour of his own views.

Mr. Norton concedes (p. liv.) that the two first chapters of Luke "always made a part of his Gospel." He thinks, indeed, that they were translated by Luke, or some other person, from a *Hebrew* writing; and he says that "the cast of the narrative has something of a poetical, and even fabulous character about it." But still, with these difficulties, Mr. Norton agrees to receive the narration as containing what is historically true in respect to its *main facts*.

He thinks, moreover, that Luke received the account given in these chapters, because it conformed to the belief of the apostles. 'Any thing contradictory to this, therefore, cannot be received as true.'

The first great stumbling-block thrown in his way by Matthew I. II. is, that the *genealogy* there differs so entirely from that of Luke. All the attempts to explain this he pronounces to be merely "conjectural;" i. e. as I suppose, to rest merely upon what is but conjecture. None of them, he says, are satisfactory.

One mode of conciliation has been the supposition, that Luke gives the genealogy of Joseph as *son-in-law*, and not improbably as also an *adopted* son of Heli. But says Mr. Norton, "if Luke had intended to give the genealogy of *Mary*, he would say so. He would not have indicated his meaning so ambiguously and circuitously as by affirming that Joseph was the son of Heli, when he meant only that he was his son-in-law, Heli being Mary's father." (p. lv.)

Yet, to a man who has made himself familiar with the manner and principles of Hebrew genealogy, nothing could be less probable than such a declaration. Luke give the Hebrew genealogy of a *female*! And give it directly, making her one of the prominent links, the very end of the chain! Where in all the Old Testament or the New is any such thing? In Matthew's genealogy, and in others contained in the Old Testament, a female is now and then mentioned; but it is merely as an *attachée*, and not as one of the principal links in the chain. Luke, be it remembered, was giving a *Hebrew* genealogy, and not a Greek one. Had a female appeared in this directly as one of the main links, the Jews of course would have said: This is no *Hebrew* genealogy.

But has not Luke in fact said something, which may naturally enough lead us to suppose that he is giving the genealogy of Joseph as merely *putative* father or foster-father of Jesus? Considered in this light, Jesus may naturally be regarded as the *putative* son, or son by reckoning, of Heli, the son of Matthat, etc. What says he of Jesus? He says: *ὢν, ὡς ἐνομί- ζετο, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἑλίου, κ. τ. λ.* Now it is a fair and exact translation of this, when we render it: "Being the *putative* son of Joseph, [the son] of Heli, etc." The writer means clearly to say, that Jesus was not in reality, but only *putatively*, the son of Joseph, the son of Heli. Joseph then is reckoned here

simply as *putative* father. And such being most plainly the case, how comes he to sustain such a relation? Because, the natural reply is, he was the husband of Mary, the actual mother of Jesus. May it not be, then, that as a putative father of Jesus, i. e. as the husband of Mary, he is here affirmed to sustain the relation of *son* to Heli? May not the *son-in-law* of Heli, moreover, and perhaps his adopted son also, be called *son*, according to the Hebrew usage? At all events, there is something here in the language of Luke which claims particular notice, and deserves more investigation than Mr. Norton or the commentators in general have given it. Does not Naomi call Ruth and Orpah her *daughters*, when they were merely the wives of her two sons? See Ruth 1: 11.

Let it be noted, that all the Evangelists of the New Testament regard it as a *plain matter of fact*, that *Christ is the son of David*. Paul says, in so many words: τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, Rom. 1: 3. Christ then, in his human nature, was a *real*, not a merely putative, son of David. But if neither the genealogy of Matthew nor Luke proves this point, where is the proof to be found? It might indeed be true, that neither of these evangelists has given us the genealogy of Mary, and still she may have been of the race of David. But would it not seem very strange, when the Jews made so much of this point (see Luke 20: 41), and when it was a most evident expectation of the whole nation, even of the lowest class of people, that the Messiah would be an actual son of David, that no one of the Evangelists should have given us a hint on this subject, which would shew that he was any thing more than a mere *putative* son of David, and this because his foster-father was descended from that king?

I have another suggestion to make; which is, that on the ground that Luke has given Joseph's genealogy as a real and not as a putative son of Heli, then either the Gospel of Luke or of Matthew (our canonical Matthew) must have lost all credit soon after their publication. Every circumstance conspires to make the impression on us, that the genealogy of Matthew belongs to Joseph, and is intended to present him as a real descendent of those named as his ancestors. We have seen, moreover, that Cerinthus, near the close of the very age of the apostles, used this genealogy for his own peculiar purposes, in regard to establishing the human origin of the Saviour. We know that Cerinthus, Justin Martyr, Celsus, and the Syri-

ac translator, all found Matthew's genealogy in their copies of his Gospel. Now if the genealogy of Luke was regarded, at that period, as contradicting that of Matthew; and it was also known that a *genuine Hebrew* Matthew was in existence which omitted the genealogy, and this saved all appearances of contradiction; how is it possible to account for it, that the early churches did not at once embrace the opportunity thus offered of being freed from the difficulty? Either they did not actually find any serious difficulty, at a very early period; or else they were unaccountably remiss and negligent in attention to this perplexing subject. If they found no difficulty, it must be because they regarded Luke as *not* contradicting Matthew; which could happen, only in case they supposed Luke to give the genealogy of Joseph as *son-in-law* of Heli. Any other mode of conciliation seems to be so nugatory, that it is hardly worth a discussion. If they found difficulty, why did they not resort at once to the obvious method of freeing themselves from it, by receiving at once the Hebrew Matthew of the Ebionites as genuine, and thus omitting the two first chapters, or at least the genealogy?

But this is not all. There is another point of view which seems to make the matter in question plainer still. Matthew (in case he inserted the genealogy), and Luke also, must have taken their genealogies from the public tables, or at any rate from the family records. They could not have framed a genealogy of their own, i. e. one which was in any measure factitious. Had either of them done this, as soon as his Gospel was published the unbelieving Jews would have gone at once to the family records, and falsified the Gospel. Were there not Jews malignant and cunning enough to do this? And were there not members even of the Saviour's family, i. e. near relatives according to the flesh, who did not believe on him? John 7: 5. Did the vigilance of unbelieving Jews sleep when the Gospels were first published—that vigilance which had persecuted to banishment and blood the early Christians? This will not be said. What was here to be done, then, when a factitious genealogy was published by a Christian writer of seeming authority? Nothing more need to be done in order utterly to overthrow the credit of his so-called Gospel, than to investigate the family records of Joseph and Mary, and bring before the public the true state of the case. Was this done? We have no account of it. Not a whisper even in Justin

Martyr, to tell us that the Jews had discredited, or could discredit, the genealogies ; and yet he gives all the Jewish objections to the Gospels, current in his day.

But let us put the subject in still another attitude. Matthew or Luke, (the objector may select which he pleases), publishes a genealogy which he knew to be factitious. Did not both of these writers know, that every opposing and malignant Jew had it in his power at once to discredit the whole of his narration ? They must have possessed less understanding than we give them credit for, not to have known this ; yea, they must even have been deficient in common sense.

But it will be said here, ' the supposition now is, that Matthew did not himself publish a genealogy.' Be it so then, for the sake of discussion ; still the case is very little if any the more favourable for those who maintain this. Cerinthus had a genealogy ; Justin had one ; Celsus had one ; the Greek translator of Matthew (if there was one) found one in his Hebrew copy of Matthew, as Mr. Norton himself concedes. Now as this translation (if it were ever made) must have been made in the first century, how came the difficulties about the genealogy then to be overlooked ? There was no point of time during that period, when there were not keen sighted and malignant Jews, who would have exposed the inconsistencies and errors of such a Gospel of Matthew, had that been liable to confutation. The family of Jesus, i. e. at least some branches of his kinsmen after the flesh, must have been still surviving, and *genealogy* was a thing that could always be easily verified.

What remains then for us to believe, except that the earliest Christians did not see, or did not find, the difficulties in the genealogies which Mr. Norton finds. If they did not, it must have been because they viewed one of them as being a genealogy of Joseph as *son-in-law*. On any other ground the case is too plain to admit of any serious doubt.

Julius Africanus (fl. 210) as quoted by Eusebius (H. Ecc. I. 7) shews a somewhat different state of feeling on the subject of the genealogies, from what we must suppose had existed in the very early ages of Christianity. He strenuously endeavoured to reconcile the apparent discrepancies between them ; and he testifies that others before him had in various ways attempted the same thing. Consequently these must have been writers within the second century. Whatever might have been the cause of it, it would seem that abroad, i. e. at a

distance from Palestine and among the Greeks and Romans, the subject of genealogies was not regarded in the same light as in and near Palestine. Hence it is easy to suppose, that difficulties would spring up; and they did in fact exist. But when they had sprung up, why did it never enter into the mind of any of the ancient fathers, that they might all be easily disposed of, by merely adopting that copy of the original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, which was in circulation among the Ebionites? Yet this obvious remedy was not adopted nor even proposed. On the contrary, Julius Africanus, as copiously quoted by Eusebius and with marked approbation, endeavours to conciliate the whole difficulty by the following ingenious conjecture, viz. ; Matthan (the proper grandfather of Joseph) was a descendant from David in the line of Solomon ; Melchi putative grandfather of Joseph sprung from David in the line of Nathan ; Nathan married and begat Jacob (the proper father of Joseph), and then died ; Melchi married his widow and begat Heli, so that Jacob and Heli were uterine brothers, the one being the real father of Joseph, and the other the putative father, i. e. *father-in-law*, inasmuch as he was the husband of Joseph's mother. Thus Africanus thinks, and Eusebius with him, that all the serious difficulties may be removed. But not with good reason, as the subject appears to my mind. For still there is no proof at all on this ground, that Christ is any thing more than a merely *putative* son of David. Julius Africanus, and after him Eusebius, does indeed suppose that Joseph married, according to the Jewish law, within his own tribe, i. e. the tribe of Judah ; but surely the family of David did not constitute this whole tribe ? This supposition, therefore, leaves open a wide chasm in the series of proof which seems necessary, in order to satisfy the mind that Jesus was the actual son of David. Besides, it is utterly improbable that the genealogy of Joseph should have, at one and the same time, been reckoned two different ways, either in the public or family tables. The only tenable position seems to be, then, that Luke reckons the pedigree of Joseph as *son-in-law*. The language of Luke is certainly peculiar, where he speaks of Joseph and Jesus. So long ago as the time of Julius Africanus this was remarked ; for he says, as quoted by Euseb. in I. 7: τὴν γὰρ κατὰ νόμον γένεσιν ἐπισημότερον οὐκ ἦν ἐξαιρεῖν· καὶ τὸ ἐγέννησεν ἐπὶ τῆς τοιαύτης παίδοποιῆς ἄχρι τέλους ἐσίωπε i. e. ' he could not have more plainly designated a *legal* [i. e.

putative) mode of reckoning generations [than he has done, in Matt. I.]; he has even omitted the word *γέννησε* through the genealogy down to the very end.'

Without resting the force of the argument, however, on the somewhat peculiar diction of Luke, it is enough to say, that two genealogies so discrepant as that of his and of Matthew, could not have existed in the primitive age, in two Gospels, without sacrificing the credit of one of these Gospels; I mean that such must have been the effect, in case they were both designed to be, and were counted as, the regular genealogies of Joseph. Two actual genealogies of him, and two that differed so much in regard to him in the *same relation*, he could not have. It is an absurdity on the face of it. One of the two, therefore, must have been of him as *son-in-law*, and not improbably as adopted Son. Then all is easy, natural, reconcilable, explicable. It was foreigners, who did not know how to estimate the Jewish genealogies, that first began to doubt and to find difficulty, and thus it is at the present day. Yet the very nature of the case shews, that such difficulties were not felt to exist, when the Gospels were first published.

To suppose, as Mr. Norton does, (p. lvi.), that 'some Hebrew convert, who composed the narration in Matt. I. II., shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, found a genealogy of some Joseph, which he mistook for the Joseph in question, and adopted it as a part of his narration; and then that this double mistake should be backed up by a third, viz., the reception of all this as a genuine Gospel of Matthew—such a reception also while the Ebionites had in circulation a genuine Matthew from which these chapters are excluded—to suppose all this, is more conjecture than we can indulge. It strangles us if we attempt to swallow it. Besides; Mr. Norton has argued from p. 27 of his book and onward at great length, to shew the improbability, or rather the impossibility, that all the copies of the Gospels should in any way whatever have been corrupted to any extent of serious importance. He has arrayed a host of arguments against this; and a strong and well armed host it is, and, as it seems to me, quite invincible. But there is not a single argument there employed by him, in defence of the Gospels at large, which may not be employed against him here with the same power. An addition of so much, so important, so difficult matter as is contained in Matt. I. II. by any writer that lived only some ten or twenty years after this

apostle published his Gospel, and this while he himself, perhaps, or at any rate some of his personal acquaintance and friends were living, who knew what he did write and what he did not—such an addition, at such a time and under such circumstances, is in itself utterly incredible. The Ebionites did indeed exclude the chapters in question, and they had party reasons for so doing; but neither the Nazarenes, nor any part of the church catholic, ever thought of freeing themselves from the difficulties of these chapters in this way.

Other objections, if the *difficulties* presented by any part of the Scriptures is to be a good ground of objection to its genuineness, might have been suggested by Mr. Norton, in the present case. These are, that while Matthew reckons only twenty-eight links between David and Christ, Luke makes forty-two. Then again, Matthew has reckoned by three series of *fourteen*; which, as the text now stands, it seems difficult to make out; he has also omitted three links between Joram and Uzziah in chap. 1: 8, viz. Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah, see 2 Chron. XXII—XXV. He has evidently omitted more still between Naasson and David; for, during this period of more than 400 years he counts only *four* generations. In all probability he has also omitted some links in the last series of fourteen. Nor is his genealogy the only one which presents difficulties. Luke, in 3: 36, inserts a *Kaṭṭán*, which belongs not to the Hebrew genealogies of the Old Testament. Now all these difficulties, except the last, might have been removed in early ages by adopting the exemplar of the Ebionites. Yet the early church, although it felt and recognized the difficulties, never once thought, as it appears, of removing them in this way. It is too late for us to do it now, by such a summary process. There are, I apprehend, other and satisfactory ways of removing the difficulties just stated; but my present object does not permit me to go into a discussion of these subjects. I must dismiss them, therefore, in order to investigate what Mr. Norton has said in respect to difficulties suggested by him.

Luke presents us with an account of Joseph and Mary, first as residing at *Nazareth*; then, on occasion of the census under Augustus, as going to *Bethlehem*, where Jesus was born; then, after the forty days' legal purification of Mary, as presenting Jesus at the temple, and afterward returning again to Nazareth. With this Mr. Norton thinks the account in Matthew I. II. substantially to disagree. 'Matthew,' he says, 'without mention-

ing any previous residence at Nazareth, relates that Jesus was born at *Bethlehem*; that the Magi paid their visit to him there; that the jealousy of Herod was so excited by the story of his birth as to order the massacre of the children at Bethlehem; that Joseph and Mary, being divinely admonished, escaped and fled to Egypt with the child Jesus; that he waited there until the death of Herod, when he set out to return, intending to go to *Bethlehem* as his proper place of residence, (as it would appear from the narration of the writer, who seems to have supposed Bethlehem to be his *home*), and was turned aside to Nazareth only in consequence of divine admonition.'

These narratives, as thus represented, Mr. Norton says, "cannot be referred to the same authentic source, being apparently so contradictory, and scarcely a single circumstance in them coinciding;" their 'general complexion also presents an aspect very different.' The account of Luke being received by the apostles, Mr. Norton 'cannot believe,' he says 'that another so unlike it proceeded from Matthew.' (pp. lvii. seq.)

After all, however, I am not persuaded that Mr. Norton's conclusions in this case are well grounded. Let us attend to several circumstances which may help us in our judgment respecting this matter.

First, is it true that the accounts of Luke and Matthew coincide "in scarcely a single circumstance?"

Both agree that Jesus was born of a virgin; that his conception was miraculous; that he was the son of David; that he was born at Bethlehem; and that angels were employed in announcing the manner of his birth, and the object of his mission. Here then are all the *essential* facts in respect to his descent, character, and station. Other circumstances added by one Evangelist, are omitted by another.

If now we go upon the ground seemingly defended by Mr. Norton, that when one Evangelist inserts what another has omitted, then one of them must be considered as *contradicting* the other; it would follow that there is scarcely a narration of any important matter in all the Gospels, in which contradiction may not be found. Nothing can be more fatal to the whole *Corpus Evangelicum* than such a principle. Nothing can be more unfounded, I may well add, than such an objection. What two histories, ancient or modern, which are not merely copied from each other, could stand on the ground of a rule of criticism like that here adopted by Mr. Norton?

But amid all these varying circumstances narrated by Matthew and Luke, is there one in Matthew which *contradicts* any one in Luke? Not a single one. All may be true which Luke declares, and yet all may be equally true which Matthew has told us. It answers no purpose here to suggest, as Mr. Norton does, that Luke applied to the mother and family of Jesus for the particulars respecting his infancy, and that there could have been but *one* story among them respecting these matters. Might not the same be said of all the other discrepant (discrepant but not contradictory) narrations which the Gospels every where contain? Did not the eye and ear witnesses, from whom these accounts were derived, tell for substance one story? Yet the particulars inserted or omitted by different Evangelists vary exceedingly from each other, some inserting what others omit, and some narrating at length what others briefly touch. E. g. compare the history of the temptation by Mark, and even by Matthew and Luke; and where is the history of the *transfiguration* to be found, except in Matthew? Where is the history of the healing at the pool of Bethesda, of the opening of the eyes of the man born blind, of the raising of Lazarus from the dead, in any Gospel except that of John? It is in vain to think of deciding, on such grounds as Mr. Norton assumes, what one Evangelist should insert, and what he should omit. Each followed his own judgment; why is his credit to be suspected on this account?

The usual conciliation of Matthew with Luke has been, the supposition that *after* the presentation of Jesus in the temple, at the end of forty days, the visit of the Magi took place; and after this, ensued the massacre at Bethelhem, the flight to Egypt, and the attempt to return to Bethlehem, which was hindered by the admonition of the angel, and followed by a return to Nazareth, so as to escape the power of Archelaus.

Mr. Norton pronounces all this to be "a very improbable solution." *Why*—he has not told us. If the Magi came, as they probably did from the regions of Babylon, or perhaps Persia, the time necessary to prepare for their journey must be several days. The journey itself must have taken up many more. From sixteen to twenty miles a day is, for the most part, the usual day's journey of oriental travellers. The route to Palestine was very circuitous, extending up the Euphrates far north, and then southward through the eastern part of Palestine. He cannot well suppose the Magi to have been at Jerusalem much

within the forty days of the purification. We may well believe that they came soon after this event. And then followed the events as related in Matthew, and already recapitulated above.

‘But Luke,’ says Mr. Norton, ‘declares that the parents of Jesus went to Nazareth after the presentation in the temple ; he says nothing of the Magi, nor of Herod, or the massacre, or the flight to Egypt.’ True it is, I answer, that Luke says, *they returned to Nazareth*. But how soon they returned, or what happened before their return, he does not tell us ; Matthew does, nor is his narrative at all inconsistent with that of Luke.

Let us look deliberately at the nature of this case. At Bethlehem Joseph and Mary had certainly resided, before the presentation of Jesus in the temple, some six weeks. That, moreover, was the *ἰδία πόλις* of Joseph and Mary, for to such place, according to the decree of Caesar (Luke 2: 3), each individual was to repair, in order that the census should be completed. Here then this couple resided at least for six weeks ; and here, it is very natural to conclude of course, they had relatives, and perhaps possessions. Now Jerusalem is only some six miles from Bethlehem, and of course we cannot suppose it to be probable, that Joseph and Mary did not return thither, for a time at least, after the presentation in the temple. It is not by any means certain, that they had any design at that time of returning to Nazareth. They were at least in their *own town* at Bethlehem. While they were here, preparing (if any one pleases) to return to Nazareth, the Magi came, and the events which followed took place. Leaving Bethlehem in such haste as they did after the warning in respect to the intentions of Herod, it is very natural to suppose, that they had business to transact there and concerns to settle, if not property to dispose of or regulate, after the death of Herod. Why wonder then that they should set out to return to *Bethlehem*, after that death took place ? What improbability, in any way, of such an event ? Nay, I may well ask : Is not probability altogether on the side of such a supposition ?

From executing their design they were prevented by divine warning. In consequence of this, they went to Nazareth.

Both Evangelists agree, then, that Jesus spent his early childhood at Nazareth ; neither tells us exactly how soon after his birth he was carried there. One of them relates circumstances, however, which shew that some months must have intervened, before this took place. Why are we to discredit his account ?

Why—any more than we should discredit Luke's account of the temptation, when compared with that of Mark and of Matthew?

Mr. Norton (p. lvii.) seems to represent Matthew, or rather the writer of the two first chapters of Matthew, as mistaking Bethlehem for the home of Joseph and Mary, because he represents them as wishing to go thither, on their return from Egypt. But may we not well ask: If Joseph and Mary went to Bethlehem as their *ἰδία πόλις*, in order to be enrolled, as they surely did according to the account of Luke; if they, or either of them, had once dwelt there, and there was their original and proper home; if, as is certain again from Luke, they staid there for forty days or more after the birth of Jesus; and if we may admit the account of their sudden flight *by night*, as Matthew avers; or even if we leave out this last circumstance; is there any thing strange, or that wears the appearance of mistake, in representing them, on their return from Egypt, as desirous to revisit Bethlehem? And especially as this was not much out of their way in returning to Nazareth, in case they designed ultimately to go thither? I cannot find the internal evidence of improbability here, which Mr. Norton seems to find, and on which he has built much of his conclusion.

Again; Mr. Norton intimates (p. lix.), that the Gospel of the Infancy in Matthew wears a fabulous costume, like the apocryphal Gospels of this kind which were current in ancient times, and some of which have come down to us. "In the story of the Magi," says he, "we find represented a strange mixture of astrology and miracles. A divine interposition is pretended, which was addressed to the false opinions of certain Magi, respecting the significance of the stars; and for which no purpose worthy of the Deity can be assigned." He represents the star as having, according to the account in Matthew, 'guided them to Jerusalem. Then, distrusting its guidance, they there inquired, where the new born king of the Jews was to be found.' Such an inquiry, Mr. Norton thinks, would have been unintelligible to the Jews there, who had not, like themselves, been divinely admonished of a Saviour's birth. Herod also, he avers, is made to act a very improbable part in this drama. How could such a contemner of Judaism believe any thing respecting their promised Messiah? Or, even if he did, how improbable must the story be of an indiscriminate massacre of

the children at Bethlehem, when Herod could have easily identified the individual child whose life he sought to take away!

How easy it is to multiply questions and difficulties of this kind, respecting any unusual occurrence in past times, every one must know who has made the experiment, or who has read many of the neological commentaries and essays of the last fifty years. Yet we need something more than merely conjectural difficulties, in order to throw aside facts which are soberly narrated. Let us see, however, whether, after all, the improbabilities of the narration in Matthew are so great, that we must feel constrained to reject the account before us because of them.

The *Magi* were a Persian and Babylonian order of men, whose business seems to have been the study of religion, and of astrology as connected with it in relation to the science of divination. They were in some respects, to the Orientals, what the Scribes and Pharisees were to the Jews, viz. the *ιερογραμματεῖς* of their country. In the book of Daniel we find them consulted by the Babylonish kings. We find Daniel, moreover, after his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, advanced to the place of president or head of this order of men.

There is then in itself no improbability, that men among the Jews of the *East* (*ἀνατολή*) who were like to the *γραμματεῖς* in Palestine, were called, after the usual fashion of the eastern country, *Magi*. Daniel had belonged to this so-called order of men; other Jews might belong to it without reproach.

Magi there were in the East, then; and Magi may have been, and probably were, among the Jews who lived there. Had not the Jews of the East copies of the Jewish Scriptures in their hands? Undoubtedly they had. Did they not, at the time when the Saviour was born, long for and ardently expect the coming of the Messiah? What says Suetonius of that period? In his *Vespas. c. IV.* he says: *Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judaeâ profecti rerum potirentur.* To the same purpose Tacitus, *Hist. V. 13*: *Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judaeâ rerum potirentur.* Deep, then, must this persuasion have rooted itself in the minds of the Jews, and wide must it have been spread, in order to give birth to such language as this by heathen historians. Josephus himself, a Pharisee and

of the priestly order, uses almost the same expressions: *Ἦν χρησμός ἀμφίβολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν, ὡς, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον, ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τὴς αὐτῶν ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης* Bell. Jud. VI. 5. 4. i. e. there was a prediction moreover, in their sacred books, which was susceptible of various writings, that about that time, some one of their own number and country should have the dominion of the world.'

Jewish Magi of the East, then, (*percrebuerat toto Oriente*), cherished the expectation that *the King of Israel* was to make his appearance about that time. To the Jews of the East, moreover, as well as of the West, his birth was signified by the star of which Matthew speaks. That there was something supernatural in the admonition to the Magi, I readily admit and most fully believe. Why is not this as probable as the angelic song on the plains of Bethlehem, and the song or prophecy of Zacharias, of Simeon, and of Anna, as related by Luke? all of which Mr. Norton on his own grounds is constrained to admit.

Let us now turn our attention to some other circumstances alleged by Mr. Norton. 'The Star,' he says, 'led them to Jerusalem; and there, distrusting its guidance, the Magi made inquiry where the new-born King of the Jews was. Afterwards it reappeared and guided them to the very house in Bethlehem, where Jesus and his mother were.'

Yet this is an account of the matter somewhat different from that which I believe to be exhibited in Matt. II. I understand the Magi as saying, in Matt. 2: 2, "We have seen his star, when we were in the East, and we have come to do him homage." That a meteor of an extraordinary nature did appear to them in their own country; that the place of this meteor was *west* from where they then were, and of course in the direction of Judaea; that an impression was divinely made on their minds of the significance of this extraordinary luminous body, (which the writer, as any Greek would do, calls *ἀστήρ*), that in consequence of this, and in connection with the general and ardent expectations of a Jewish king as mentioned above, they set out upon their journey to pay an early and joyful homage to this new king; is what Matthew relates, and what no one is able to gainsay by shewing either the impossibility or the improbability of it. That *ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ* means, as I have rendered it, *while we were in the East*, is plain enough from the fact, that if the star had been eastward of them, they would

have travelled of course in that direction, and not have gone to Jerusalem.

But does Matthew say, as Mr. Norton represents him as saying, that ‘the star led them to Jerusalem,’ that is, accompanied them on their way thither? Not at all. The guidance afforded them was purely its first appearance, the direction in which it appeared, and the strong expectation that *the King of the Jews* was about to be born. When persuaded that his birth had taken place, where should they go to make inquiry respecting him but to the capital of Judea? The star they did not see on their way. At least, so Matt. 2: 9 would seem very plainly to intimate. It was not until they had commenced their journey from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, that the meteor again appeared. “When they saw it they rejoiced greatly;” as it was very natural they should do. “It came and stood over the house where the young child was;” which shews that now, at least, its course was low down in the atmosphere, so low that it could designate any particular locality by standing over it. Is any part of all this more miraculous, more incredible, than the account of Luke as to events during the infancy of the Saviour? No one can establish the allegation that it is.

But Herod, we are told, ‘is made to act a very improbable and foolish part.’ *Improbable*, however, I do not deem it. Could it be possible that Herod was ignorant of the universal expectation, among the Jews, of the appearance of their King Messiah, who, as they confidently believed, would enable them to throw off both his and the Roman yoke, and make them masters of the world? If this be possible, it is utterly improbable. Did not Herod know that the Jews most heartily hated him, and were longing to be delivered from his tyranny? He doubtless did. His precautions, his jealousies, his suspicions always on the alert, his military guards, his repeated and horrible cruelties toward even his own family and some of his best friends, because of his jealousy and suspicion—all these serve to shew what might be expected from Herod, the moment he heard of a new-born King, to whom the whole Jewish nation would joyfully and eagerly pay their homage. Herod deride such a matter as this, and treat it with scornful neglect! Why one might as well expect Nero or Caligula to put up with a personal insult, and meekly to remonstrate with him who should smite them in their faces. Nothing could be more in unison with Herod’s character and whole temperament, than the order for the massacre at Bethlehem.

‘ But Herod is represented as guilty of the consummate folly of an indiscriminate massacre, when nothing could have been easier than to identify the individual child whose life he sought.’

Herod then, a more passionate, cruel, and despicable tyrant, if possible, than Nero himself, is expected, it would seem, to make minute inquiry which of all the babes at Bethlehem was the one that he should wish to destroy. Where is he to get the information? According to Matt. 2: 5 seq. Herod did assemble the chief priests and scribes of the people, and demand of them where *ὁ Χριστός*, i. e. the Messiah whom they expected, was to be born. They said: At Bethlehem. This was enough for Herod; and this they argued from prophecy, as their appeal to it shews, and not from any information which they had respecting what was revealed to the Magi. It matters not as to Herod, whether we suppose that he believed in prophecy or not; it was enough that the Jews believed in it. It is enough for our purpose that he knew, that if either a real or supposed Messiah was born, the Jews would rally around him at once, and overthrow their present oppressor. Herod moreover meant to be secure against any mistake or failure on this occasion; and so he ordered an indiscriminate massacre.

If Mr. Norton should say: ‘ Jesus had been presented in the temple, and there public acknowledgement was made of him, so that Herod might have traced him out individually;’ my answer would be, What probability that Herod knew any thing of all this? Herod was at Jerusalem but a small portion of his time. His concerns led him elsewhere; and Cesarea was the place where he enjoyed most popularity and had the most adherents. Even if he had been at Jerusalem, during the time of the presentation, he would have been one of the last men to whom pious persons would have been likely to communicate the knowledge of a new-born King. There is no probable way in which we may suppose him to have known, or believed that he could obtain an individual knowledge of the exact place where Jesus was. Of course the indiscriminate massacre in question was the ready and obvious dictate of his jealous and cruel spirit. Subsequent to such a massacre, there could be no pretence among the Jews, that the new-born king, after all, had escaped the hands of the assassins, and some other babe been murdered in its place. An indiscriminate massacre, then, would plainly be viewed by Herod, as essential to the extinguishment of the rising Jewish hope in respect to their long wished for king.

And is it not plain too, that, because of such a massacre, all the then present and rising hopes of the Jews, even of the pious, (who knew not of the flight of Joseph and Mary), were actually extinguished? On what other ground can we account for the deep and long silence of all Judea, during nearly thirty years, in relation to the new-born king, whose birth had been ushered in by so many prodigies, even if Luke's account of the matter, and no more, is to be admitted? It has often been matter of wonder among the pious, and of scoffing among the impious, that after all the miraculous annunciations of the Saviour, and the prodigies attending his birth, there should for thirty years be such a profound and mysterious silence in Judea with respect to him. Where were the Simeons and the Annas—the shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem and those to whom the glad tidings had been published by them and others? Why was not the glorious Redeemer, in his humble and quiet occupation at Nazareth, sought out, and brought forward to the notice of the admiring world?

My answer would be, that the massacre at Bethlehem extinguished all the rising hopes of the pious Jews in that quarter, and dissipated the fears of the ungodly. Providence so ordered it, that Jesus should be withdrawn in the dead of night to Egypt, and none should know of his escape. His return was to a distant, obscure, and despised town of Galilee, where no Jew would expect to find him, and therefore none would go to seek him. There his parents and he waited in quiet and in silence, until the proper time for the commencement of his ministry arrived. Had they noised abroad his origin and his pretensions, during his early life, danger would have followed, civil and religious commotions been excited, the jealousy of tetrarchs stirred up, and unnumbered evils have been the natural and immediate consequence. As things were ordered, all this was prevented. And that this prevention was the result of some such occurrence as the massacre at Bethlehem, which extinguished all present hopes about the new-born king, seems to my mind so probable, that I can in no way account for it in a manner that is satisfactory, how things went on as they actually did, without a supposition of some such event as Matthew has related.

I cast myself now on the candour of my readers, and ask them, whether there is any such incongruities and improbabilities in Matthew's Gospel of the Infancy, as Mr. Norton urges

upon us? On the other hand, does not the story of Matthew seem to be quite essential to the satisfying of our minds, how the youth and early manhood of Jesus could have been spent in the silence and quietude in which it evidently was? The Bethlehem massacre had quieted the fears of the enemies to the claims of Jesus; it appears also to have extinguished the rising hopes of friends. Subsequent to this, Joseph and Mary, admonished of danger, and aware of the importance of shunning jealousy on the one part and popular expectation on the other, lived in an obscure and despised place, from which, as Nathaniel intimates (John 1: 46), no good thing was expected to come. There they peaceably acquired the means of subsistence by bodily labour; and there Jesus pursued the same occupation as his foster-father, and was quietly and peacefully subject to his authority. There he did not develop himself as differing from others apparently his equals in age and condition, until the fulness of time had come. In this way, envy, jealousy, malignity, and (what was no less dangerous to the youthful Saviour) popularity and applause, were neither excited nor occasioned. Premature development would have called forth premature persecution and early death. As matters were arranged by an all-wise and over-ruling Providence, every thing went quietly on "until the fulness of time had come."

One might dwell here with great satisfaction, on the lovely character which the Saviour exhibited, during so long a period, and in such a humble condition. Conscious of a heavenly origin and of a dignity above that which belongs to any creature named in heaven or on earth; knowing that he possessed power to fill Palestine with admiration of his deeds and astonishment at his wonderful attributes; conscious also of a power which could easily summon countless hosts of angels to his aid, in case he should fall into danger through the malice of his enemies; yet he forbore any development of himself, kept on in his humble, patient, daily toil for his sustenance, and all this for years after he had come to a vigorous maturity. This is indeed a part of his character which has seldom been considered, and of which little has been said. To my mind, however, it is not less wonderful, and scarcely less attractive, than the god-like benevolence which he displayed in the garden of Gethsemane and on the cross.

I find myself insensibly drawn to moralizing on this shining and lovely trait in the character of Jesus. Let us return to our critical investigations.

I must make a remark on one thing more which Mr. Norton has said, in connection with the history of the visit to Bethlehem by the Magi. This is, that a divine interposition in respect to giving them an intimation of the birth of a Saviour is "pretended," and that "no purpose worthy of the Deity can be assigned for it;" p. lix.

If such a visit did take place on this occasion, a divine interposition seems to be something more than *pretence*. We find it, indeed, actually indispensable; or, in other words, we cannot well account for it, considering the time and manner in which it happened, in any other way.

Mr. Norton seems to think, that the affair of the star was merely a business of *astrology*, and that it is incongruous to suppose an interposition on the part of heaven in aid of such a science. My view of the case is very different. I am not compelled to believe that these Magi were really *astrologers*, in case they were Jews, any more than I am obliged to believe that Daniel was an astrologer because he was a Magus. I must and do believe, that on the appearance of the star, a divine admonition was given to the minds of the Magi respecting the design of it; just as one was given to Abraham, to leave his country and kindred and go to Palestine and sojourn there. The whole account leads to this impression; and I know of no more reason to reject divine interposition here, than in the cases of it mentioned by Luke, in his Gospel of the Infancy.

And is there "no purpose worthy of the Deity" in all this? Is it nothing, that this homage was paid to the new-born King, by distinguished persons from a distant land? Nothing—that the Jews of the eastern region should be advertised in this way of the birth of a Saviour, as well as those of Palestine? Nothing—that his high prerogatives and exalted state should thus be taught, as well as by the choir of angels on the plains of Bethlehem, or by the devout exclamations of Simeon and Anna? And even if we could not perceive at once, as doubtless we cannot, all the purposes to be answered by such an event, can we not find as much in it that is explicable, as we can in the miracle of the water which was turned into wine, or of the withering of the fig tree which was cursed; or of the destruction of the swine on the borders of the lake? Mr. Norton admits the truth of these miracles; does he see a purpose of God in them more explicable and more worthy of the Deity, than in the visit of the Magi? If he does, I can only say that it seems more easy to me, to explain the latter than the former.

I have said enough, as I would hope, to remove some of the difficulties which Mr. Norton has thrown in our way, in regard to this part of Matt. I. II. I come, therefore, to another portion of his remarks.

The beginning of Matt. III. *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις*, he apprehends, may be thought to throw some objections in the way of commencing the Gospel of Matthew here. In order to remove this difficulty, however, he supposes, first, that the translator of Matthew into Greek, or the compiler who added the two first chapters to his Gospel, inserted these words as “a form of transition” from the one narration to the other. The original Gospel, he thinks, began thus: *John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judea*; for this, he says, is the manner in which the Gospel of Mark begins.

If the reader, however, will take the pains to open his New Testament at the beginning of Mark, he will find there a natural introduction to a Gospel, *the design of which was only to give an account of the public ministry of Jesus*; and a very different one it is, from that which Mr. Norton would here lead us to suppose. Indeed, the beginning of a Gospel by the words which he suggests, would be so abrupt, so unintelligible to a reader who was a stranger to the course of events in Palestine, that the bare recital of it is a sufficient refutation of it.

Mr. Norton himself seems to feel this; for he immediately suggests another beginning: *In the days of Herod*, meaning the tetrarch of Galilee. So the Gospel of the Ebionites began; only it ran on in such a way as to create no small difficulty in the sequel. “In the days of Herod, King of Judea,” was its commencing clause. Unfortunately for this clause, however, this same Herod (the King) had been dead some twenty-eight years, when John the Baptist made his appearance in public, as immediately stated in the sequel. Mr. Norton thinks that Epiphanius, who tells the story of this notable commencement of the Gospel of the Ebionites, “by a blunder of his own added the words *King of Judea*.” This is an easy way, to be sure, to dispose of at least a part of the difficulty. But who does not see, that it is merely cutting the knot, not untying it? If we are at liberty to reason thus, and conjecture whatever facts we please, (how can I call this *reasoning*?) then, *deducere aliquid ex aliquo* is fully within the power of every controvertist.

After all, the beginning of Matthew's Gospel, according to Mr. Norton, would be a wonderful beginning—entirely *unique*.

In the days of Herod? What Herod?—exclaims the reader at once. Herod the *tetrarch*, says Mr. Norton. But how is the reader of this Gospel, fifty or more years after all the Herods were dead, to know that the *tetrarch* was meant? There is no context, no previous matter to give him a hint of this. There is no like thing, moreover, in all the Scriptural records. When the *days* of a person are mentioned as a point in chronology, the person meant must necessarily be designated; above all, where many persons about the same time had the same name, must this be done; as it is always both in the Old Testament and in the New. But if we are to credit Mr. Norton, nothing of this kind was done by Matthew. *Quodcunque mihi narras sic—*.

‘But we have a more serious difficulty still,’ according to Mr. Norton. ‘If we allow chap. I. II. to be genuine, the last events mentioned are Archelaus’s reign and Joseph’s residence at Nazareth. . . . It was not *in those days*, but thirty years afterwards, that John the Baptist was preaching in the wilderness of Judea.’

Indeed! Archelaus’s reign is to be sure mentioned in Matt. 2: 22, and as a reason why Joseph repaired to Nazareth, rather than to Bethlehem. But the chapter *ends* with an account of Joseph’s fixing the abode of himself and family at Nazareth, and the third chapter begins with the clause, *in those days*, i. e. plainly and simply, during the period of the abode of his family at Nazareth. This comports with simple fact. It was really and truly what happened, viz., that John entered on his public ministry while they abode at Nazareth. What “serious difficulty” there can be in all this, I am not able to see. I am sure Mr. Norton has not succeeded in presenting any. It is not to Archelaus’s reign, but to Joseph’s sojourn at Nazareth, to which *those days* refers.

Mr. Norton says, at the close, that ‘he thinks these reasons ought to satisfy us that the two chapters in question did not proceed from the apostle Matthew.’ He then turns to the examination of the two first chapters of Luke; and “although,” he suggests, “the style is rather poetical than historical;” although, “with its real miracles, the fictions of oral tradition had probably become blended;” although, “with our present means of judging we cannot draw a precise line between the truth and what has been added to the truth;” yet we may on the whole, as he concludes, regard the account of this Evangelist as being substantially correct.

What kind of *faith* we can have in a Gospel which we regard in such a light, is for Mr. Norton to tell us. With such a faith I am sure we could say nothing more appropriate than “Lord, help our unbelief!”

But—to our immediate purpose. I may now be permitted to ask, at the close of this examination, by what kind of evidence or process Mr. Norton has laboured to establish his cause? What, I ask, is the question before us? A question simply of *lower criticism*; one which respects the mere fact, *whether there is evidence that Matthew I. II. is genuine*. And how are such questions to be decided? By *a priori* reasoning; by objections of a theological cast; by our mere estimate of the probability or improbability of events related? Surely not. Whether the story in Matthew I. II. is probable or improbable, strange or a thing of common occurrence; whether it teaches Unitarian or Trinitarian theology; has nothing at all to do with the question of criticism, which is simply and only, *whether critical witnesses speak for or against it*.

And what is the result of our inquiries with regard to this last point? The result is so clear, that not a doubt of a *critical* nature can be sustained. All the known Mss. and Versions on the face of the earth speak but one language. All the Christian writers of the primitive ages speak but one language. We can trace the contents of these chapters in Justin Martyr, in Celsus, in the Syriac Peshito; we find Cerinthus using the matter of them about A. D. 80, before the apostolic age had passed away. No part of the church, except a small insignificant sect of the Ebionites, has ever ventured to doubt their genuineness, or to tamper with them. We have now as it were word for word and letter for letter, in the Syriac Version (made in the second century as we have good reason to believe), the very text which lies in the canonical Greek Matthew before us. A *critical* doubt on this subject, can scarcely be less than a critical heresy.

Yet Mr. Norton, passing by all this, suggests *internal difficulties*. We have also examined them. We have seen that a very different estimate from his may be made out from all the facts as they lie before us. And if it could not, his proof is not legitimate. We cannot betake ourselves to theologizing, on a mere subject of lower criticism. The deductions which might be made out in our own way of reasoning, cannot be shewn to have been made out by the mind of Matthew. Even if chap. I. II. of his Gospel have given us erroneous statements, (which

however I do not believe), yet in the present state of criticism we are obliged to attribute these chapters to Matthew. The question now before us is not whether he has truly said or written this or that, or erroneously, but *whether he actually said or wrote it*. That question is settled, until some evidence yet unknown, at any rate yet unproduced, shall be developed, which will give a new aspect to the whole matter.

At the close of this somewhat protracted investigation, I cannot refrain from adding a few considerations, which are quite different from and opposite to the general nature of those suggested by Mr. Norton, and examined in the preceding pages. If they do not go to prove the genuineness of Matthew I. II., they may afford some aid in removing suspicion that these chapters are an interpolation.

It has often been remarked, and truly, that no one of the Evangelists refers so frequently to the Old Testament, or quotes from it so often, as Matthew. I say this has been *truly* observed; for Matthew plainly quotes at least thirty-five times from the ancient Scriptures, while Mark quotes eighteen, Luke twenty, and John fourteen times. I reckon here only the plain and obvious cases of quotation. The *references* in all the Gospels to sentiments contained in the Old Testament, would add to the list of appeals to the ancient Scriptures; but these are proportionally as frequent in Matthew as in the other Evangelists.

This characteristic in Matthew has been accounted for by many on the ground that he wrote more immediately for the benefit of the Jews, to whom frequent appeals to the Old Testament would be peculiarly gratifying. Matthew, it has been thought, labours in a peculiar manner to prove the Messiahship of Jesus from the predictions of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Whether these views be well grounded or not, it is still true that a prominent characteristic in his style is such as has now been stated. How then does the style or manner of chapters I. II. compare with this? Just as we should expect it would in case these chapters were from the hand of Matthew. No less than five appeals are here made to the Old Testament, viz. in 1: 23. 2: 6. 2: 15. 2: 18. 2: 23. Was it a matter of mere accident, or even a matter of design, that the supposed interpolation, or rather the writer of a narrative which another and subsequent redactor interpolated, thus imitated the manner of Matthew? I verily believe it was neither. There is no *imitation* here, but the hand of an original writer.

Again; Matthew is the only one of all the evangelists who has taken any notice of *dreams*, as means of divine admonition. In 27: 19 he tells us of a dream by the wife of Pilate, warning her that Jesus, accused before the tribunal of her husband, was innocent. In Matt. 1: 20. 2: 12, 22, we have the like occurrences.

Of all the Evangelists or writers of the New Testament, Matthew is the only one who uses the word *ὄναρ*, *dream*. This is employed in 27: 19, and in all the passages just referred to in chapters I. II. Is this a mere accidental thing, belonging to the *translator* of Matthew, as Mr. Norton would have us believe; or does it look like a mode of expression familiar to the original author of the whole book?

It would be easy to produce a number of idioms or phrases employed in chapters I. II. and afterwards in the other part of Matthew's Gospel, but found nowhere else in the New Testament. But I forbear, lest I should tire the patience of my readers. They may be found in Gersdorf's *Beiträge*; who has expended incredible labour on the examination of chapters I. II. Mr. Norton would probably say: 'These peculiarities belong to the *translator* of Matthew, and can as well be accounted for in this way as in any other?' Yet some of them are of such a nature, that I should doubt whether this could be made credible. They seem to characterize *original composition* rather than *translation*.

Thus have I gone through with the details of this subject; and I now submit the whole to the reader, and to Mr. Norton himself, and ask the question, whether any reader of Matt. I. II. and of the rest of his Gospel, would have ever thought that the whole book is a *translation* from another language, or that different parts of it were composed by different writers, unless some doubts about the facts in chapters I. II. had set him to making an effort to get rid of this part of the book? After reading again and again, in order to see whether I could detect any sensible difference in style, language, mode of thinking, order and manner of narrating, or even in the use of the small particles of transition, etc., I must confess unhesitatingly that I have been able to discover no such difference. Nor can I think Mr. Norton himself, who appears to understand the laws of lower criticism so well, would ever have doubted, if some *a priori* views of what Matthew ought, or ought not, to comprise in his Gospel, had not led him to doubt.

I cannot resist the persuasion, that if there be a clear case in respect to the genuineness of any passage of the New Testament which has ever been controverted, the one before us is such a case. Most fully do I assent to the words of Griesbach, at the close of his critical examination of this subject (Comm. Crit. II. 55), who says: "*Cum igitur parum roboris insit argumentis omnibus adversus duorum istorum capitulum authenticam prolatis, genuina ea esse censemus; ipsaque inde ab initio, cum primum in publicam lucem emitteretur Matthaei Evangelium, huic adhaesisse, ac in autographo seu archetypo jam extitisse, nulli dubitamus.*"

ARTICLE V.

THE SCRIPTURAL IDEA OF ANGELS.

By Lewis Mayer, D. D. late Prof. in the Theol. Sem. of the Germ. Ref. Church, York, Pa.

THE existence of a world of spirit is as much a subject of observation and experience as the existence of a world of matter. The human soul is a spirit manifesting itself in the affections and operations of mind; there is a spirit in the brute which is the seat of sensation, of memory, of pleasure and of pain; the reproduction of animals, the vegetation of plants, the crystalization of minerals, and chemical agencies, are not the effects of inert matter, but must be referred ultimately to a cause which acts spontaneously and rationally. Ancient philosophy conceived that cause to be a soul of the world, and considered the world an animated, sentient, and rational being. The Bible makes it God, and the spirit of God, which pervades all things.

All spirit is not of the same order. There is an infinite difference, both of nature and of attributes, between the uncreated infinite Spirit, and all created finite spirit. There may also be an order of spirits among the creatures, perhaps embracing many genera and species, superior to man, and existing in a state of being which is not subject to the observation of our senses; nor, perhaps, even to be apprehended by the human mind, in its present connection with matter.

That intelligent creatures, superior to man, and still at an

infinite distance from God, may exist, is a position which reason cannot disprove. The fact, however, of their existence does not follow of course from the possibility of it. Neither do I know that it can be demonstrated by reasoning from any abstract principle. All that reason can do is to make out a high degree of probability by analogical argument from facts previously known or granted. It is of little weight to say, that inasmuch as the distance between man and the Deity is infinite, it is improbable that man is the highest of animated beings, and the only creature which is endowed with reason; for, whatever conception we may form of rational creatures, superior to man, to occupy the chasm between him and his Creator, the distance between those creatures and the Deity must still be infinite, and the same necessity of supposing others above them will return forever. It may then be urged, that, as no creation can be infinite, it must be admitted that the Creator has stopped somewhere; and no sufficient reason can be given, why he should not have stopped at man, as well as at any conceivable grade in the scale of existence above him.

The argument from analogy is of more value. It may be constructed as follows. It is probable that the other planets, in the system of which our globe is a part, are inhabited by living creatures; because in our world every part teems with life and activity; the earth, the air, and the water abound with animated beings; the microscope reveals to us a world of animalcules, in immense variety of form, of character, and of magnitude, beyond the limits which confine the unassisted sense, and extending in minuteness beyond the bounds even of microscopic vision; often so numerous that many thousands of them are contained in a single drop of water; and so minute that they find room enough in it to move and to sport without hindrance. Yea, such is the Creator's attention to the production and sustenance of living existence, that even the food of many of the larger animals is animated; and these again constitute so many worlds upon which smaller species live and feed. It is therefore probable that the other globes in the solar system, which are known to be subject, in other respects, to the same general laws as our own, are not left destitute of living creatures. If each of the fixed stars, which are known to resemble our sun, is the centre of another system of worlds, and the source of light and heat to globes that revolve around it, it is also probable that those worlds are the habitations of living and

sensitive beings. But if all the heavenly bodies, like the globe upon which we dwell, are furnished with living creatures, it is not probable that all their inhabitants are irrational animals, which can have no knowledge of their Creator, and can bring to him no offering of virtue and praise. In this world man is the lord of the lower creation; all the inferior creatures are adapted to his use, and subjected to his power; and there is a gradation in the scale of existence, through various forms of organization and character, from rude matter up to man, who is constituted an image of his Creator, and forms the link which connects this world with the invisible Deity. If other worlds are analogous to our own, there must be in them the same sort of gradation, terminating in a highest which represents God, and connects them with him.

If there be rational beings in other worlds, it is not likely that they are of the same order and species with man. The human race could not subsist in any other of the planets which are known to us. In Mercury, for example, they would be consumed with heat, and in Herschel destroyed by cold; and in none of the planets can there be vegetation or animals like those with which we are acquainted here. If those bodies are inhabited, it must be by natures that are adapted to them, and are therefore wholly different from any which are known to us: and if in each of them there be a class of beings upon which the image of God is impressed, it must be one that differs entirely from the human race.

If man is not the only intelligent creature in the universe, and if every other world contains a distinct order of the same class, it is very improbable that they are all equal with respect to their physical and intellectual powers. As far as our observation extends in the works of God, we discover diversity united with regularity. All organized being is reducible to classes, orders, genera, species, and varieties; no two individuals of a species are in all respects alike; there is everywhere a continual variation, and a rising from the less in perfection to the greater, or a descending from the greater to the less; there is an oak and a moss, a lion and a worm, an eagle and a mite; there is a sun to illuminate a system of worlds, and a meteor to shine momentarily in the dark. The human species is diversified by every variety of beauty and deformity, and by every grade of rank from the king to the beggar, and from the sage to the idiot. If the same law prevails throughout the universe,

no two worlds can be alike, and there are, doubtless, as many different grades of intelligent beings as there are worlds which they inhabit.

Neither is it probable that man is the highest in this class of creatures. On the contrary it is more likely that he is the lowest in the scale. A compound of spirit and matter, and of matter in its gross sluggish form, he is allied to the earth on which he treads, and the connecting links between him and its rude matter are the brute, the plant, and the crystalization. While some of the individuals of the species exhibit intellectual powers of a high order, others are so little removed from the more sagacious of the irrational animals, that the transition from the one to the other is made by a single step. We may therefore conclude, that, if there be among the creatures of God other grades of intelligent beings, they are higher than man.

All this reasoning is hypothetical ; we assume in it, on probable grounds, what we cannot strictly demonstrate. From such premises the conclusion can be nothing more than probability. It is however a high degree of probability that is obtained in this case ; and there being no argument of equal weight, nor, so far as I can see, of any considerable weight, on the opposite side, we approach so near to certainty, that we may take the fact as sufficiently proved.

The religious philosophy of every age, in the Gentile world, has taught the existence of a class of beings between the supreme Deity and man. In the theology of all idolatrous nations, as there was a plurality of divinities to whom their worship was addressed, so there was a subordination of rank among the objects of worship, and one supreme deity that presided over the rest ; and among the inferior gods there were such as approached very near to man, while others scarcely differed from the one who was acknowledged as supreme. But besides these inferior beings, to whom the title gods was given, the Gentiles held the existence of a class of beings between the gods and men, consisting of different orders, who were the ministers of the gods, and mediators between them and men ; bearing to the gods the prayers and offerings of men ; and to men the answers and the commands of the gods. The Hindoos have their Dejotas, the Persians, and others of the Magian sect, their Amschashpands, Izeds, Fervers, and Dews ; the Greeks had their Daemons, and the Romans their Genii.

Hesiod, who lived about the time of Homer, divides intelligent natures into four classes, namely, gods, daemons, heroes, and men. For so doing he is commended by Plutarch. Plato taught that the whole space between the gods and men was occupied by daemons, which were, however, of different kinds. The Pythagoreans, the Stoics, the Peripatetics, and, indeed, every sect of philosophy among the Gentiles, except the Epicurean, held a similar doctrine.

In the Holy Scriptures we have frequent notice of spiritual intelligences, existing in another state of being, and constituting a celestial family, a hierarchy, over which Jehovah presides. The Scripture, however, does not treat this subject professedly, and as a doctrine of religion, but adverts to it incidentally as a fact, as it does to other facts, in its religious history and the course of its instructions. It speaks of no obligations to these spirits, and inculcates no duties toward them. A belief in the existence of such beings is therefore not an essential article of religion, any more than a belief that there are other worlds besides our own ; it belongs not so much to religion as to philosophy ; but such a belief serves to enlarge our idea of the works of God, and to illustrate the greatness of his power and wisdom ; and in this way it exerts an important and salutary influence upon the heart.

The names or titles, by which the Scripture designates these celestial beings, are spirits, *Greek* πνεύματα *pneumata* ; angels, *Greek* ἄγγελοι, *angelloi* ; *Hebrew* מַלְאָכִים *mlakhim* ; and in the Old Testament אֱלֹהִים and בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים *elohim*, and *bne elohim*. The first of these terms has respect to their essence, and the second to their office. The last two denote their rank in the scale of being. *Gesenius* denies that *elohim* ever means angels ; and he refers in this denial particularly to Ps. 8: 5, and Ps. 97: 7 ; but he observes, that the term is so translated in the ancient versions. In the epistle to the Hebrews, where these texts are referred to, the same translation is given, Heb. 1: 6. 2: 7.

Elohim is the plural of *Eloah*. According to *Gesenius* *Eloah* is a primitive, and the verb *Alah* is a derivative from it. The verb does not occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, but is used in the Arabic, in the sense of *to reverence*, *to dread*. *Eloah* is therefore that which inspires reverence, fear, dread ; or which creates astonishment, alarm and awe ; and *Elohim*, in its ordinary sense, denotes a plurality of such objects. When the plural is joined with a verb, or with other dependent words, in the

singular, it is called the plural of excellency, and has a singular meaning, with the secondary idea of greatness or superiority. In this form, it is usually applied to the true God; but sometimes also to an idol; as to Dagon the god of the Philistines, Judges 16: 23; to Ashtoret, the goddess of the Zidonians, to Chemosh the god of the Moabites, to Milcom the god of the Ammonites, 1 Kings 11: 33; and to Bael-zebub the god of Ekron, 2 Kings 1: 2, 3. With plural adjuncts it is usually translated as a plural; but in some instances the *pluralis excellentiae* occurs in this form, and is applied to the true God. See Genesis 20: 13, 31: 53. 2 Samuel 7: 23. Ps. 58: 12.

Elohim is applied to the true God, Gen. 1: 1, etc., and in very many places. It is applied to idols with the same frequency, but usually with plural adjuncts. Ps. 96: 5, *et passim*. Rulers, and especially kings, are called elohim, Ps. 45: 6, 7. 82: 1, 6. 138: 1. Exodus 22: 28. In 1 Samuel 28: 13, an apparition is so called: "And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascend out of the earth;" *Hebrew*, "I saw elohim etc." In Ps. 8: 5, celestial spirits are called elohim: and in Judges 13: 21, 22, the *pluralis excellentiae* of this term is used in speaking of a single angel of the Lord; as in 1 Samuel 28: 13, of a single apparition.

It appears from this usage that the title elohim is a common appellation, given to a class of beings who are the objects of fear, of reverence, and of dread to men. Its application to kings and rulers is a tropical use of it: in its ordinary acceptation it designates invisible beings, superior to man, existing in another state of being. Such is Jehovah; such are angels; such the gods of the Gentiles were believed to be; and such, in the opinion of the Gentiles, were the departed souls of eminent men. Such the witch at Endor considered the ghost of Samuel, which, to her astonishment, appeared at her bidding. This title did not distinguish the true God from other elohim; not always even when used as a plural of excellency. For the purpose of distinction he is called the living God, *elohim chayim*, and *elohim chai*, in opposition to the gods of the Gentiles, which were either inanimate objects, as the stars, the elements, etc.; or dead men, the souls of deceased ancestors: and from all other elohim he is distinguished by the title Lord God; in the Hebrew text, *Jehovah Elohim*. So Moses taught the Israelites, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." *Hebrew*, "Jehovah our elohim is one Jehovah;" that is, Jehovah, the object of our

reverence, is an only being, Deut. 6: 4. In the ninety-sixth Psalm, the inspired author says, "For the Lord is great, and greatly to be praised; he is to be feared above all gods." *Hebrew*, "For Jehovah is great, and greatly to be praised; he is to be feared above all elohim:" which implies that all elohim are objects of fear, but none of them in the same degree, nor with the same propriety and justice, as Jehovah. The distinctive titles *אלהים חיים* and *אלהים חי* *Elohim chajim*, and *Elohim chai*, living God, and *Jehovah Elohim*, *Jehovah our Elohim*, etc., are of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament.

The tropical use of elohim, as a title of kings and other rulers, was founded in the profound and superstitious veneration with which the people regarded the ruling powers. Rulers in ancient times were always of the nobility, whom the common people were accustomed from their childhood to consider a superior order of men, possessing a portion of divinity, and naturally and necessarily above them; and kings, abounding in riches, invested with absolute power, and glittering in splendor, were considered so near the gods, that they were esteemed worthy of honors that differed but little from religious adoration. The title elohim, which was often given to them in common with the objects of worship, designated them as beings that inspired veneration and awe similar to that which was inspired by the gods themselves. So the ancient Greeks derived both the authority of their kings, and their ability to administer the government; their bodily strength, stature, and beauty; their courage, enterprise, and wisdom, from Jupiter, and dignified them with the titles of *theoeides θεοειδής*, *isotheos ισοθέος*, godlike, and *diogenes διογενής*, heaven-born, born of Jupiter. See *Creutzer's Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Voelker*. Vol. 3. B. 3. Cap. 1.

The customary use of the plural *elohim*, and the extensive application of it, seems to have had its origin in the polytheism of the people who spoke the language. The Hebrew was not exclusively the language of the Israelites; neither was it even originally theirs. It was one of the dialects of a common language which was spoken by the nations that inhabited the countries of western Asia, between Persia and the Mediterranean, and between Armenia and the Indian ocean. The other dialects were the Chaldean, the Syriac, and the Arabic. Hebrew was the dialect of the Canaanites, including the Phenicians. All these nations were polytheists. Abraham was a native of Ur in

Chaldea, and was seventy-five years of age when he went into the land of Canaan. In his time these several dialects might differ but little; but if there was any difference, he spoke the Chaldean, and not the Canaanitish. During their long residence in Canaan his descendants acquired the language of this country, and, of course, learned it as it was. They did not originate its usages, but adopted them as they found them already settled. It was the language of polytheists. So, indeed, were all the dialects. In the time of Moses, when the first of the sacred books were written, all these countries were immersed in the grossest idolatry. They had not only their *Eloah*, but their *Elohim*; and these were found in every thing in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, which was adapted to excite fear, dread, or hope, or could create astonishment or admiration. A polytheistic language was now used to express monotheistic ideas.

I will now examine the texts in which the term *elohim*, or *bne elohim*, designates celestial spirits, distinct from Jehovah, and superior to man.

Ps. 8: 3—8, “When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet: all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fishes of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea.” “For thou hast made him a little lower than the *angels*,” is in the Hebrew text, “For thou hast made him a little lower than the *elohim*.” By *elohim* the ancient as well as the modern translators understood those spirits whom we call angels. So also the author of the epistle to the Hebrews understood the word. The connection, moreover, demands this interpretation. We have in the text God, the Creator, distinguished from all his works; who is addressed, in the first verse, as Jehovah our Lord, whose name is excellent in all the earth, whose glory is above the grandeur of the starry heavens, and in comparison with whom man is as nothing. We have next the noblest of his creatures in the visible world, man, whom he has crowned with glory and honor, and has placed over the works

of his hands in the earth, the air, and the seas. We have lastly the *elohim*, whom man resembles, but does not equal. They must therefore be an order of intelligent beings above him: if they are not such, what are they? What can be higher than man, but a more perfect intelligence? Man was made *a little lower* than the *elohim*. There cannot, therefore, be a great chasm between him and them; as there is between him and the Deity. There may be many orders of *elohim*, or many genera and species of the same order, some of which may be immeasurably above humanity, and may approach much nearer to the Deity; yet as a class of superior beings, there is among them a point of comparison in which man is but a little lower than they.

Genesis 3: 1—5, “Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made: and he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden? And the woman said, we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but as to the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die; for God knoweth, that in the day ye eat thereof, your eyes shall be opened: and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil.”

Throughout this and the preceding chapter, whilst the historian speaks, the name of God, in the Hebrew text, is *Jehovah Elohim*; in the conversation only between the woman and the serpent, it is simply *Elohim*, in the *pluralis excellentiae*, with the verb or the participle in the singular:—“hath Elohim said? —“Elohim hath said”—“Elohim is knowing that.” In the last sentence, “Ye shall be as *elohim*, knowing good and evil,” the participle *knowing* is plural, which, according to the common usage, makes *elohim*, with which it is in agreement, a common plural. The authors of the English version very justly considered it such, and translated *keelohim*, אֱלֹהִים, by *as gods*, The Greek version of the *Seventy* also rendered it in the same sense *oi theoi*, οἱ θεοὶ, as gods.

Eve, in all her simplicity, could not be so stupid as to imagine, that, by eating of the fruit of a tree which God had created, she could become like him; but she might conceive it possible that she could attain to the state of other created beings, who were then advanced above her. It is implied in the text, that she had a knowledge of the existence of such an order of

beings ; and this is, doubtless, in itself very probable. In that state of innocence, when they were accustomed to the sound of God walking in the garden, and so familiar an intercourse subsisted between heaven and earth, it is certainly not unlikely, that the first human pair were favored with angels' visits, and therefore knew what angels were : they saw their coming and their departure, and perceived that they were intelligences of a higher order.

The superiority of the *elohim*, to which the tempter directed Eve's attention, consisted in this, that their eyes were open, and they knew good and evil. The latter is the consequence of the former ; if their eyes were open, then they knew good and evil.

The phrase, to know good and evil, means to know all things, and to know them in such a manner as to be able to distinguish one thing from another. A similar phraseology occurs 2 Sam. 14: 7, where the woman of Tekoah says to David, "The word of my lord, the king, shall now be comfortable ; for as an angel of God, so is my lord, the king, to discern good and bad." And again in verse 20, "And my lord is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth." All things that are in the earth include both the good and the evil things. To know good and evil, is therefore to know all things, and to be able to discern good and bad among them. Of this knowledge the tree in the midst of the garden seems to have been a symbol ; and the prohibition of its fruit to our first parents may have signified, that there were things which it would not be safe for them to know ; and they must therefore restrain their curiosity, and be content with such knowledge as God would choose to teach them. It was an idea of antiquity that knowledge had introduced vice and misery into the world ; and Solomon says, "Lo, this only have I found, that God made man upright ; but they have sought out many inventions," Ecc. 7: 29 ; by which he means, that their discoveries had injured their virtue, and marred their happiness. But the tempter represented, that the *elohim*, possessing the knowledge of good and evil, were, by virtue of it, happier than man, and solicited Eve to aspire to an equality with them in this higher felicity.

Genesis 3: 22, "And Jehovah said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil ; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat,

and live forever; therefore the Lord God (Jehovah Elohim) sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from which he was taken."

"The man is become like one of us;" i. e. like one of the *elohim*; certainly not like Jehovah, nor like one of the three in the Godhead. As yet the likeness was only in the attribute of knowledge, in which they had made an advance that was, however, fatal to their happiness. Another, in which it might be attained, if they should be permitted to continue in the garden, was immortality; and this was prevented by sending them forth to till the ground. All this is symbolical language, adapted to the simplicity of a primitive age; and its literal sense must not be closely pressed. What we learn from it, so far as our present purpose is concerned, is, that there is an order of celestial beings, dwelling with God, who possess superior knowledge and are immortal.

Ps. 97: 7, 9, "Confounded be all they that worship graven images, that boast themselves of idols; worship him, all ye gods," (*Hebrew* all ye *elohim*.)—"For thou Lord, (*Heb.* Jehovah,) art high above all the earth; thou art exalted far above all gods," (*Heb.* all *elohim*.) The Greek version of the *Seventy* renders, *elohim* in verse 7 by *angelloi auton*, *ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ* his angels; and in verse 9, by *theoi theoi* Gods. The epistle to the Hebrews cites the last clause of verse 7 thus, "Let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. 1: 6. These authorities show that the ancient Jews, and the inspired writers of the New Testament, understood the term *elohim* to include angels. In this text they took it to mean angels only; because they considered the gods of the Gentiles dead things and nullities, and could not conceive that an exhortation to worship Jehovah should be addressed to them. In verse 9, the *Seventy* appear to have taken *elohim* in its widest sense as meaning whatever is an object of reverence to man; so that the text might read thus: "For thou, Jehovah, art high above all the earth; thou art exalted far above every object of reverence."

Genesis 1: 26, 27. Retaining the Hebrew appellation, the text reads thus: "And Elohim said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion, etc. So Elohim created man in his image; in the image of *elohim* created he him, etc." Throughout this chapter, and the first three verses of the second chapter, the name of God is uniformly *Elohim*, in the plural of excellency, having the verb and pro-

noun in the singular; but in the last recited clause, "in the image of elohim created he him," there is nothing to make elohim a *pluralis excellentiae*; and taking it in connection with the phraseology of verse 26, "Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness," it appears to be a common plural, and to man the celestial spirits, whom the supreme Elohim, the Creator, addresses. Here the generic term elohim is first applied to God, the Creator, and next to that order of intelligent beings who constitute the celestial family over which God presides. When God made man, he did not take for his pattern any of the lower animals which had been previously created; but he took himself, and the elohim, who dwelt with him, and who, like himself, were intellectual natures; and man was thus made in the likeness of his Creator, and in the likeness of the elohim, who bore his image, and enjoyed fellowship with him. The words, "Let us make man, etc." are addressed to these celestial beings; God is conceived as a Sovereign sitting in council with his princes and people, in the manner of primitive antiquity, when kings were the fathers of their people, and did nothing without their consent. The language of the text is poetic; the conception is symbolical, designed for embellishment and effect. A similar trope occurs 1 Kings 22: 19—22, and Isaiah 6: 1, 8.

Job 38: 4, 7, "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding."—"When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Sons of God is in the original *bne elohim*, בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים sons of elohim, or sons of the elohim. The time referred to is the time of the creation of the world, when Jehovah laid the foundation of the earth. It is manifest that the morning stars and the sons of the elohim are the same. They were present when the heavens and the earth were created, and celebrated that great event with song and joyous acclamation. They must therefore be rational beings who existed before the creation of man. The sons of elohim cannot be a mere poetic personification of the stars; for these were not in existence when creation began; and only one star, moreover, is the morning star. *Sons of the elohim* seems to be an idiomatic phrase for *elohim*; like *sons of men*, for *men*, Ps. 4: 2. *Sons of my people* for *my people*, Gen. 23: 11. *Sons of strangers*, for *strangers*, Isaiah 56: 6. *Sons of the Grecians*, for *Grecians*, Joel 3: 6. *Sons of the mighty*, (*bne elim* בְּנֵי אֱלִים) for the

mighty, a title given to the inhabitants of heaven, the angels, in Ps. 89: 6.

Job 1: 6, and 2: 1, "Now there was on a day when the sons of God (*bne haelohim*, sons of the *elohim*), came to present themselves before the Lord, (before Jehovah), and Satan (the adversary) came also among them."—"Again there was a day when the sons of God (*bne haelohim*, sons of the *elohim*) came to present themselves before the Lord, (before Jehovah), and Satan came also among them to present himself before the Lord," (before Jehovah).

The name of God, in these chapters, when he is distinguished from other *elohim*, is Jehovah. Those who came to present themselves before him are not called sons of Jehovah, but sons of the *elohim*. The sense of the terms, sons of the *elohim*, is determined by the parallel place in chapter 38: 7, and must therefore be admitted here. The sons of the *elohim*, who came to present themselves before Jehovah, are the same that sang together and shouted for joy, when he laid the foundations of the earth. The scene is laid in heaven, in the house of God. The idea is that of a day of audience and inquiry, when the chief men of the kingdom came to pay their homage to the sovereign, and inquisition is made concerning the affairs of the kingdom. Satan, who is one of the number, but suspicious and malevolent, comes with the sons of the *elohim* to present himself before Jehovah, having walked as a spy through the earth, and being resolved to denounce a good man whose sincerity he suspected.

Daniel 3: 24, 25, 28, Nebuchadnezzar, having ordered Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to be cast into the fiery furnace, and seeing four men, loose and unhurt, walking in the midst of the flames, rose up in haste, and said to his counsellors, "Did we not cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O king. He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the son of God." But in the original the words are, "like a son of *elahin* לְבֶן-אֱלֹהִים, *elahin* being the Chaldee form of *elohim*. And this son of *elahin* is in verse 28 called an angel of God. "Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who hath sent his angel and delivered his servants."

In our language we have no word corresponding to the Hebrew term *elohim*. It answers nearly to the Greek *daimon*;

or *daimonion* the neuter of the adjective *daimonios*, divine. In the usage of Homer, and other Greeks, *daimon*, or *daimonion* is a divinity; *to daimonion* is the supreme God; and *daimones* or *daimonia* is equivalent to *theoi*, gods; but in Hesiod and others it denotes a class as middle beings between the gods and men.* The appropriate term in English for the celestial intelligences distinct from Jehovah, is Angels; by which we translate the Hebrew *Mlakim* מַלְאֲכִים, and the Greek *Angelloi* ἄγγελοι. Both the Hebrew and the Greek term signifies messengers. Under this title this order of beings is so often mentioned, both in the Old and the New Testament, that it is unnecessary to produce the Scripture testimony.

The title *mlakim*, *angelloi*, messengers, does not indicate either the grade or the nature of the heavenly intelligences, but the office in which they are employed. They uniformly appear in the Bible as the ministers of God, who do his pleasure. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews says of them, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister unto them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Heb. 1: 14. In the Old Testament, David thus invokes them, "Bless Jehovah, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word. Bless Jehovah, all ye his hosts, ye ministers of his that do his pleasure," Ps. 103: 20, 21. And Daniel speaks of them as ministering to, and standing before God, in allusion to the custom of oriental courts, where the officers of the monarch stood before him, ready to receive and to execute his commands, Dan. 7: 10. This idea of angels pervades both the Old and the New Testament; and on this account the terms *mlakim* and *angelloi* are those which are most frequently used to designate this order of beings.

This title, however, is used in the Scriptures with as much latitude as the title *elohim*. As *elohim* designates whatever is an object of reverence to man, so *malak*, *angellos*, *angel*, denotes whatever God chooses to employ in order to execute his purpose, or to manifest his presence or his power. It is applied to priests, Malachi 2: 7, where the Hebrew text reads, "The lips of the priest should keep knowledge; for he is the angel (*malak*,) of Jehovah of hosts." In Malachi 3: 1, both

* Creutzer's Symbolik und Mythologie der Alten Voelker. Vol. III. ch. 1.

Ideas of things change in the progress or the decline of knowledge, while the same words continue in use to express them. The modern idea of spirit is not derived from the Scriptures; it is a product of philosophy; obtained not by revelation, but by abstraction. The student of mathematics learns by abstraction to conceive a point without bigness, a line without breadth, and a surface without thickness. So in metaphysics we form the idea of a substance without parts. When Jesus said, "God is a spirit; and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth," I have no doubt he meant, that God is a purely immaterial being; but when he used the term *pneuma*, those who heard him would connect with it no other idea than that with which they had previously been acquainted; and he was necessitated to leave them and their successors, with regard both to this and to other subjects, to the slow progress of intellectual culture and development.

When the ancient Jews called angels spirits, they did not intend by that term to deny that they were endued with bodies. If they affirmed that spirits are incorporeal, they used the term in the sense in which it was understood by the ancients; that is, as free from the properties of gross matter.* St. Paul distinguishes between a natural body and a spiritual body, 1 Cor. 15: 44. The latter is the body with which the saints shall be endued in the resurrection. It will still be material, though it be spiritual. The apostle's idea of spirituality was therefore consistent with the idea of corporeity; and by a spiritual body he could only mean a body consisting of a subtil matter, which is imperceptible by our senses as they are now constituted.

In the Scriptures angels always appear with bodies, and in the human form; and no intimation is anywhere given that these bodies are not real, or are only assumed at the time, and then laid aside. It was manifest, indeed, to the ancients, that the matter of these bodies was not like that of their own, inasmuch as angels could make themselves visible, and vanish again from their sight: but this experience would create no doubt of the reality of their bodies: it would only suggest to them that they were not composed of gross matter. Jesus, after his resurrection, appeared often to his disciples, and vanished again before them; yet they never doubted that they saw the same body which had been crucified, though they must have per-

* See Enfield's History of Philosophy, B. 2. chap. 12. sec. 1. Vol. I.

ceived that it had undergone a very important change. I do not mean that the fact, that angels always appeared in the human form, is a proof that they really have this form; but that the ancient Jews believed so. The instructions contained in the Holy Scriptures are always necessarily adapted to the actual state of knowledge at the time, to the opinions which are entertained, and the mode of thinking which prevails, among the people to whom they are originally addressed; for otherwise they would not be understood. The critical student of the Scriptures will distinguish between the substance and the form of these instructions, and will expect to find in the latter, only what the intellectual character of the people, and the state of knowledge among them, and their prevailing opinions were. Angels *may* have the human form; but many other forms are possible.

We read of angels eating and drinking, Gen. 18: 8. 19: 3. But in Judges 13: 15, 16, when Manoah said to the angel, "I pray thee, let us detain thee, until we shall have made ready a kid for thee," the angel answered him, "Though thou detain me, I will not eat of thy food." The manner in which the Jews removed the apparent discrepancy, and the sense in which they understood such places, appears from the apocryphal book of Tobit, where the angel says to Tobit and his parents, "It seems to you, indeed, as though I did eat and drink with you; but I use invisible food, which no man can see," Tobit 12: 19. In Psalm 78: 25, the manna which fell from heaven is called "angels' food." The author of the apocryphal book of Wisdom says, "Thou didst nourish thy people with angels' food, and didst send to them from heaven bread prepared without labor which afforded every pleasure, and was suited to every one's taste," Wisdom 16: 20. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus, the form of which is adapted to the ancient mode of thinking, represents the saints in Paradise, with Abraham at their head, enjoying themselves in the pleasures of a feast, Luke 16: 23—25. Among the christian fathers, Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria taught that angels ate a celestial food.* The Gentiles ascribed aërial bodies to their gods, and believed that they lived upon ambrosia and nectar. The Stoics thought that the stars, which all classes ranked among the gods, were nourished by exhalations from the seas and rivers. Daemons

* Muenscher's *Dogmengeschichte*, Vol. II, sec. 116.

were believed to feed upon the fumes of sacrifices. All this supposes that such beings were endued with bodies.

Origen, a father of the third century, applies the term *asomatōs aōiōuatos*, *incorporeal*, to angels. He uses the term, however, in a twofold sense. Sometimes he means by it a purely spiritual nature; and this he ascribes to the Deity alone, and not to any created being. At other times he uses it to denote a subtil, etherial body, in contra-distinction from a body consisting of gross earthy matter. In his opinion no created being could be entirely incorporeal; and hence he supposed angels to be endued with bodies of an etherial substance. This opinion was entertained by many of the fathers.* It is allied to the doctrine of the Platonic school of philosophy. Plato taught that the supreme Deity is a pure spirit, and all other intelligent beings are portions which have emanated from his essence; but all these emanations are compounded with portions of matter. He spoke also of the *ochema ōχημα*, the material vehicle of the soul.† It is not improbable that God is the only pure spirit in existence: it is certain, at least, that no created spirit can be of the same essence with him. Neither does it seem very improbable that there are forms of matter with which the most exalted spirits are compounded. When matter is considered abstracted from its qualities, we can no more conceive what it is, than we can conceive what the substance of spirit is: and it would therefore be presumptuous to say that the Creator may not have united them throughout the intellectual universe.

When Jesus told the Sadducees that those who shall be accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection from the dead, will neither marry nor be given in marriage, but shall be like the angels, Luke 20: 35, 36, he taught by implication that angels have no distinction of sex.

The Scripture never makes mention of female angels. The Gentiles had their male and female divinities, that were the parents of other gods. In the Scriptures the angels are always males. They are so represented, not to mark a distinction of sex, but because the masculine is the more honorable gender.

Angels appear, in some instances, of prodigious stature and great magnificence, Rev. 10: 1—3; in others as ordinary men, Gen. 18: 8. 19: 3; sometimes they are described as youthful,

* Muenscher's Dogmengeschichte. Vol. II. sec. 116.

† See Enfield's History of Philosophy, Vol. I.

Mark 16: 5, but never exhibiting marks of age. The constant absence of the features of age, indicates the continual freshness and vigor of immortality, and the recency of their origin in contradistinction from the eternity of God, who alone is ever spoken of as "the Ancient of days," Daniel 7: 9.

Angels are represented as constituting a celestial hierarchy. The Bible speaks of cherubim, of seraphim, of seven angels that stand before God, of an archangel, and of innumerable multitudes of angels. In the New Testament, Jesus himself makes no such distinctions; unless Matthew 18: 10, be an exception; but his apostles speak generally of "angels, and authorities, and powers;" and of "principality, and power, and might, and dominion," in heaven, 1 Pet. 3: 22. Ephes. 1: 21.

Cherubim are not real beings, but mystic symbols, the meaning of which it is not easy to ascertain. In Ezekiel 1: 10, they are four in number. Each of them has four faces; namely, the face of a man, of a lion, of an ox, and of an eagle. They are connected with four wheels, which, as well as the cherubim themselves, are full of eyes; and in moving all move together, at the same time, and in the same direction. Above them is the likeness of a throne; and upon the throne, the glory of Jehovah. In Revelation, ch. iv. the living creatures are also four; they are in and round about the throne, upon which Jehovah sits; there are four faces, but each of them has only one face; the first is like a lion, the second like an ox, the third has the face of a man, and the fourth is like a flying eagle; each of them has six wings, and is full of eyes; they act severally, but in concert, and give glory, honor, and thanks to Him who sits upon the throne. In the tabernacle, and in the temple, two cherubs with expanded wings were placed upon the ark of the covenant. Jehovah was conceived to be seated between the cherubs, and to have the lid of the ark for his footstool. There he gave his oracles and dispensed mercy; wherefore the place was called the mercy-seat.

After the expulsion of Adam from paradise, cherubs guarded the tree of life. In the 18th Psalm, David celebrates his deliverance from great distress, by a signal interposition of God, which he describes as attended with earthquake, darkness and tempest, and says, "And he rode upon a cherub, and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind." The latter member of the parallelism explains the former: to ride and fly upon a cherub, and to fly upon the wings of the wind, are the same

thing. The wind, the storm, is therefore one of the things which are symbolized by the cherubim; and we may hazard the conjecture, that the cherubim are the symbol of nature, operative in the various natural phenomena, in the earthquake, the storm, the dark cloud, and the thunder; but exhibiting itself most noble in living creatures, of which man, as the lord of the visible world, the ox, as the chief of domestic animals, the lion, as the noblest of the beasts of the forest, and the eagle, as the king of birds, are the representatives. The cherubim are four in number, because, in the opinion of the ancients, nature consists of four elements; they have four faces, looking at the same time to the four ends of heaven, to indicate the universal presence of the same powers; they act in concert to denote the harmony of nature in its operations; they are full of eyes, to signify the perfect intelligence with which all those operations are performed; Jehovah is enthroned above the cherubim, or in the midst of them, to represent his sovereignty over universal nature; and the four living creatures cease not, day nor night, to give glory, honor, and thanks to him that sitteth upon the throne, because all nature bears testimony, unceasingly, to the glorious attributes of Jehovah. If this idea of the cherubim be correct, the cherub that guarded the way to the tree of life, was some natural phenomenon, perhaps a volcanic eruption, that terrified and kept in awe the first parents of our race, conscious of transgression and guilt.

The seraphim are mentioned only once, in Isaiah 6: 2, 6. The word occurs, indeed, in Numbers 21: 6, 8, and Deut. 8: 15, where it means *fiery serpents*, and in Isaiah 14: 29, and 30: 6, where, in connection with the participle *meopheph* מֵוֹפֵפֵף, it signifies a flying serpent; but in no other place does it signify intelligent beings. *Saraph* in Hebrew means to burn. Gesenius derives *seraphim* from an Arabic word signifying to be noble, to be superior; according to which the sense of *seraphim* will be, nobles, magnates. In Isaiah's vision they stand above the throne; each of them has six wings; with twain they cover their faces, and with twain they cover their feet, and with twain they fly. And one cries to another, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." They have much resemblance to the cherubim, and may, like them, be symbolical beings. They may also be a distinct order of heavenly intelligences.

The Seven Angels that stand before God are first mentioned

in the apocryphal book of Tobit, ch. 12: 15, where Raphael, the guide of the younger Tobit in his journey, is made to say, "I am Raphael, one of the seven angels who stand before the Lord." They are afterwards spoken of in the Revelation of John, as the seven spirits which are before the throne of God, 1: 4; the seven spirits of God, 3: 1; the seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven spirits of God, 4: 5; the seven eyes upon the horns of the Lamb, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth, 5: 6; the seven angels which stood before God, and to whom were given seven trumpets, 8: 2. They are not elsewhere mentioned in other books of the Bible. But Gabriel announces himself as an angel who stands in the presence of God, Luke 1: 19; and Jesus speaks of angels which do always behold the face of his Father which is in heaven, Matt. 18: 10. There is here an allusion to the seven princes of Persia, whose privilege it was to have unrestrained access to the king at all times. They are described in the book of Esther, chap. 1: 14, as "the seven princes of Persia and Media, *who saw the king's face*, and who sat the first in the kingdom." This order of nobility was first instituted in the reign of Darius Hystaspes. Zoroaster, the reformer of the Magian religion, who lived in this reign, seems to have taken from the political constitution of the kingdom the idea of the seven Amshashpands, which he assigns to Ormusd, as next to him, in the kingdom of light. Unless the mode of expression in the texts of Luke and of Matthew, above referred to, is a mere accommodation to a prevalent manner of thinking and speaking among the Jews of that time, they authorize the belief that there is a class of angels who, in a peculiar sense, stand before God; and it is then not the thing itself, but the manner of expressing it that is borrowed from a foreign source. Perhaps they may be the same as the seraphim, in the sense of nobles, magnates.*

The title archangel occurs in the epistle of Jude, "Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, etc.;" and in the first epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, ch. 4: 16, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the

* The number seven may be a definite for an indefinite number, and the idea of seven such angels may be an accommodation to the fact that the number of these Persian princes was seven.

archangel, and with the trump of God : and the dead in Christ shall rise first." The same angel is named by other titles in the prophecies of Daniel, ch. 10: 13, 26 and ch. 12: 1, where he is called "Michael, one of the chief princes,"—"Michael your prince;" that is, of the Jews,—and "Michael, the great prince, who standeth for the children of thy people." The angelic princes, in Daniel, are angels who preside over particular countries and nations. Of these Michael is there represented as one, and as the prince who presides over the people of God. He appears again in the book of the Revelation of John, as the chief of the angels who fight, in that symbolical warfare, against the dragon and his angels, and cast them out of heaven, Rev. 12: 7. The terms in which he is spoken of in the New Testament, seem to designate him as the only one of his class. Some commentators have considered him the same with Messiah, but for no sufficient reason that I can perceive. Messiah is mentioned in the same places of the New Testament by other titles. Michael may be the chief of the seven angels who stand before God. In that case the title archangel would be applicable to all the seven, but in an emphatic sense to him. His name, *Michael*, is compounded of three words, *Mi*-*cha*-*El*, מִיכָאֵל, i. e. Who is like God? It is a challenge addressed to the whole creation to find anywhere one who is equal to God; and it implies that Michael, the most exalted among the intelligences of heaven, is not.

The terms Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers, imply subordination of ranks. There must be subjects where there are thrones; but here the Scripture leaves us in the dark, and rebukes our curiosity by its silence. It has told us as much as we need to know. It has informed us that there is diversity of grades in the world of spirits, and that the same law which the Creator has established in our own world, obtains also in others, throughout his great empire. He is one God; and he is everywhere the same.

The number of the angels is described as being very great. Daniel saw, in his vision, thousands of thousands ministering to the Ancient of days, and ten thousand times ten thousand standing before him, Dan. 7: 10. The epistle to the Hebrews speaks of an innumerable company of angels, Heb. 12: 22. And St. John in his Revelation "beheld and heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the living creatures, and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten

thousand, and thousands of thousands," Rev. 4: 11. These numerical terms are used in the Scripture to express numbers that exceed computation. There is good reason to believe that angels are much more numerous than the whole race of man, which constitutes but one order and one species.

St. Paul distinguishes the whole intelligent creation into things in heaven, things on earth, and things under the earth, Philip. 2: 10. The same distinction is made in the book of Revelation, "And no one in heaven, nor in the earth, nor under the earth, was able to open the book, nor to look thereon." And in the same chapter, the whole animated creation is described as "Every creature which is in heaven, and in the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea," Rev. 5: 3, 13. The ancients conceived the universe to consist of three grand divisions, each of which was supposed to be immeasurable and boundless. In their opinion, the earth, which they considered an immense plain, terminating on all sides in a boundless ocean, occupied the middle: the region above it they called heaven, and the region below it hell; in the Hebrew *sheol*, שְׁאוֹל; answering to the Greek *hades*, ᾗδης, and the Latin *infernus*. So David conceived of it, when he said, "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there; if I take the wings of the morning, and fly to the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand hold me," Ps. 139: 8—10. So also Zophar in Job, "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea," Job 11: 7—9. Heaven was believed to be the dwelling place of the Elohim, Jehovah and his angels; the earth was the residence of mankind; and sheol, which they represented as dark, silent, and inactive, was held to be the habitation of the dead.

The Gentiles assigned divinities to each of these regions; they had their celestial gods in heaven, their terrestrial gods on earth, and their infernal gods in hades; all of whom were objects of worship. The Holy Scripture acknowledges one only God, whom it represents as present on earth, and in hades, and filling immensity, while his appropriate dwelling is in heaven; and claims for him exclusively all religious veneration. Though

angels, as well as Jehovah, are called *elohim*, which the Greek version commonly renders *theoi*, gods, they are nowhere recognized as proper objects of worship; they themselves disclaim it; the Scripture commands them, as well as the children of men, to worship Jehovah; and in the visions of heaven, which were vouchsafed to the prophets, they all unite in the profoundest adoration and praise to him who sits upon the throne. When Manoah requested an angel, saying, "I pray thee, let us detain thee, until we shall have made ready a kid for thee," the angel answered him, "Though thou detain me, I will not eat of thy bread; and if thou wilt offer a burnt offering, thou must offer it unto the Lord," Judges 13: 16. The Psalmist exhorts the spirits of heaven, in the text we have before quoted, "Worship him, all ye Elohim;" and again, in another place, "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word. Bless ye the Lord, all ye his hosts, ye ministers of his, that do his pleasure." And again, "Praise ye him, all his angels; praise ye him, all his hosts," Ps. 97: 7. 103: 20, 21. 148: 2. In Isaiah's vision, the seraphim, who are near the throne of God, cover their faces and their feet with their wings, in token of the profoundest and most awful veneration, and cry to one another, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory." And the author of the book of Revelation tells us, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever," Isaiah 6: 2, 3. Rev. 5: 13. All this is in obedience to that first commandment in the kingdom of Jehovah, "I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have no other gods before me." How widely does all this differ from the Olympus of the Greeks! It bears upon its face the evidence of a divine origin, and rebukes into silence and shame the wisdom of this world, that erred so egregiously in its searching after God.

According to the Holy Scriptures the Elohim live forever, Gen. 3: 22; the angels shall never die, Luke 20: 36; but no being besides God himself has essential immortality, 1 Tim. 6: 16. Every other being therefore is mortal in itself, and can be immortal only by the will of God. Angels, consequently, are not eternal, but have a beginning. In the ancient systems of philosophy, which were based upon the theory of two eternal

principles, the active and the passive, God and matter, while corporeal things were represented as formations out of original matter, all spirits were conceived to be emanations from the Deity, and portions of his essence. From this origin was deduced their immortality. They were therefore conceived to be necessarily immortal; they might lose their individuality by reabsorption into the Deity, but their essence could never cease to exist. This notion has not ceased to be entertained in our own time; we still have, in one of our most admired hymns, the idea that the human soul is a "vital spark of heavenly flame." This philosophy seems to be favoured by the text in Genesis 2: 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (*neppesh* נֶפֶשׁ animal); and the place in Ecclesiastes, chap. 12: 7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit (*ruach* breath,) to God who gave it." But these texts speak not of the soul, but of the breath, which the ancients considered the principle of life, and which God both gave and took away. The Scripture never represents spirits as emanations from God, and portions of himself, but as creatures, mere effects of his creative power, and his good pleasure. Hence it draws so broad a line of distinction between him and them, strictly forbids to place them beside him as gods, claims immortality for him alone, challenges the universe to say what is like him, commands every knee to bow to him, and declares that nothing shall glory in his presence. Angels are enumerated among the creatures of God, where all his works are invoked to give him glory: "Praise ye him, all his angels; praise ye him all his hosts. Praise ye him, sun and moon; praise him all ye stars of light. Praise him, ye heaven of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens. Let them praise the name of Jehovah: for he commanded, and they were created. He hath also established them forever: he hath made a decree, which shall not pass away," Ps. 148: 2—6. Comp. Ps. 103: 20, 22.

Moses has not made mention of the creation of angels in his account of the origin of the world. After saying in general terms that, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, he descends to particular details, describes first the condition of the earth before it was reduced to form and replenished with vegetation and animals, or was furnished with a canopy over it, with luminous bodies to enlighten it, to rule the day

and to beautify the night ; and then relates the work of each successive day. He speaks of the creation of the light, of the firmament, of the seas and the dry land, of plants, of the heavenly bodies, of animals that inhabit the waters, the air, and the land, and lastly describes the creation of man. In all this there is no mention of an order of intelligent beings superior to man ; yet they were certainly not of less importance, nor a less illustrious manifestation of creative power, than all these things. Moses well knew the existence of angels ; for he often speaks of them in his subsequent history. His silence concerning them, in this place, is therefore of easy explanation only on the supposition, that they do not belong to that creation of which he designed to speak ; and consequently, that they existed before. This supposition is supported by the texts in Job, chap. 38: 7, and in Genesis, chap. 1: 26, 27, and chap. 3: 22, which have already been considered. The design of Moses was to give an account only of the origin of the visible world, of which man is a component part. Nothing can therefore be inferred from his cosmogony to show, either that creative power was not exerted before this world began, or that it is not exerted still. The fourth commandment in the decalogue seems, indeed, very plainly to refer the origin of all things to the work of the six days : “ In six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, and all that is in them.” So also the place Genesis 2: 1—3, “ Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and rested on the seventh day from all his work, which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because in it he rested from all his work, which he had created and made.” But in both these places, and in all others, where the work of the six days is spoken of, or alluded to, the creation which is meant is the creation of the visible world, with which alone Moses is concerned ; and the universal terms, which are used in speaking of it, must therefore be understood as comprehending only all that belongs to this world.

When the Holy Scripture speaks of angels as the ministers of God, who are employed to execute his will, it does not mean that he needs their aid, nor that he receives any from them. Its language is, “ The everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary ; there is no searching of his understanding,” Isaiah 40: 28. It is not for

his own sake, but for theirs, that angels are so employed. Activity in the pursuit of some interesting end is essential to the happiness of all rational creatures. No living creature, indeed, is as happy in a state of confinement as in possession of liberty, until art and custom have subdued the original principles of its nature : and even then it will still seek enjoyment in motion, as far as its cage or its chain will permit. Man without employment is restless, and contrives various methods to rid himself of the heaviness of vacant time ; he resorts to company, or to books, or to play ; and if no other means be left, he will count the spots upon the walls of a prison, or amuse himself by training a spider. Angels could have no heaven, if they had no employment : it is this that calls into activity the faculties with which God has endowed them ; and it is in this activity that their felicity is found. They are employed in executing the will of God, and are therefore conscious of always acting right ; or what is the same thing, of acting always in accordance with the nature of God, and in harmony with the nature of things. Mere activity is not itself the source of pure and enduring happiness. The enjoyment which it affords is disturbed and embittered by the consciousness of acting contrary to the divine will. The will of God is not a mere arbitrary volition, that is superinduced upon the nature of things, and may be changed : it is the law which emanates from the nature of God, and is developed and impressed upon all his works, by a moral necessity : it is therefore immutable, omnipotent, and eternal. With this will the creature must accord, or not exist, or exist in misery. The acts of free agents that are opposed to it, are to the harmony of the universe what a disturbing cause is to the movements of a great machinery ; and as nothing can prevail against omnipotence, the result of such opposition can only be the destruction of the being from which it comes. Angels are employed in doing the divine will, that all their acting may be in harmony with the nature of God and of his works : and that the consciousness of this harmony may secure their complete felicity.

The ultimate design of God with regard to all his rational creatures is their happiness ; and as the means to this end, their holiness : or, what is the same thing, their conformity to his own nature in their moral character. The spirits of heaven are always represented as equally holy and happy. *Their* chief end is to please God : they never appear to act with reference to

themselves, or as having their own happiness in view as the object of pursuit: God is to them the centre of attraction, to which, in all their movements, their thoughts, and their affections turn. In the visions of heaven, which were granted to the prophets, angels stand before the throne of Jehovah, in token of their readiness to receive and execute his commands; or celebrate the excellency of his character, absorbed in the greatness of their theme, and apparently unconscious of any other interest. But this very devotion; this entire forgetfulness of themselves, and absorbedness in reverence and love toward God, constitutes a moral union with him, and consummates their happiness. Felicity and holiness are inseparable, except in thought. When they are viewed apart, the former is the chief end of God, and the latter must be the chief end of the creature.

This absorbing attention of the spirits of heaven to Jehovah must not be so understood, as to exclude a proper regard to his works. It must be recollected that God is everywhere, and his law is every where; he is seen in the star; he is manifested in the flower; the worm declares his presence; and the seraph cries to his fellow, "All the earth is full of his glory." Especially is God revealed in the person of Christ, in the work of redemption, in the conflict of light and darkness, in the trials and the victories of his people, and in the just punishment of the impenitent wicked. Angels, therefore, take an interest in our world, because God is in it; and because it is a great theatre upon which his glory is displayed; that glory above all which is the most winning and kindling, the riches of his love and grace. St. Paul says of angels, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister unto those who shall be heirs of salvation?" Heb. 1: 14. And in Ephesians, "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God," Ephes. 3: 10. St. Peter calls the sufferings of Christ, and the glory which should follow, and the salvation of fallen men by the ministrations of the gospel, "Things which the angels desire to look into," 1 Pet. 1: 11, 12. Jesus himself declares, "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner who repenteth," Luke 15: 10. Angels announced the Saviour's birth; and a multitude of the heavenly host, when they had heard the message to the shepherds at Bethlehem, burst forth into a song of praise, giving glory to God in

the highest, and rejoicing in the prospect of peace on earth, and of good will among men, Luke 2: 8—14. They ministered to Jesus during his public life, were present in his temptations, in his agony and death, in his resurrection, and at his ascension into heaven, and watched with intentness the development of the purpose of redemption in these singular events. The apostles were cheered in their trials by the presence of angels, Acts 12: 7; and the least among the people of God are represented as subjects of their attention and care in seasons of danger and distress. David says, "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them," Ps. 34: 7. Jesus, speaking of the infant children of believers, says to his apostles, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven," Matt. 18: 10. And in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, the pious poor man, whom the world suffered to perish in wretchedness, is borne of angels in his death, and carried to Abraham's bosom, Luke 16: 22. In all this activity the angel's mind is toward Jehovah, beholding his glory, and proclaiming his praise; he is, as it were, "standing before the throne."

It was a favorite opinion of the christian fathers, that each individual is under the guidance of a particular angel who is assigned to him as a guardian. They spoke also of two angels, the one good and the other evil, whom they conceived to be attendant on each individual: the good angel suggesting good thoughts, restraining from evil practices, and aiding in the pursuit of virtue; the evil angel, on the contrary, hindering every good purpose, and endeavoring to seduce into the paths of sin. The Jews, except the Sadducees, cherished the same belief. Among the Gentiles the Greeks had their tutelary daemon, and the Romans their genius. The former spoke also of a good and an evil daemon, who contended for the government of the individual on whom they attended; and the latter had their good and their evil genius, who strove in the same manner for the same object.

Of the doctrine of the christian fathers on this subject, the following passage from the Shepherd of Hermas may serve as a specimen. "There are two angels with man; one of righteousness, the other of iniquity. And I said unto him, sir, how shall I know that there are two such angels with man? Hear,

says he, and understand. The angel of righteousness is mild, and modest, and gentle, and quiet. When therefore he gets into thy heart, immediately he talks with thee of righteousness, of modesty, of chastity, of bountifulness, of forgiveness, of charity, and of piety. When all these things come into thy heart, know then that the angel of righteousness is with thee. Wherefore hearken to this angel and to his works. Learn also the works of the angel of iniquity. He is first of all bitter, and angry, and foolish; and his works are pernicious, and overthrow the servants of God. When therefore these things come into thy heart, thou shalt know by his works that this is the angel of iniquity. And I said, sir, how shall I understand these things? Hear, says he, and understand. When anger overtakes thee, or bitterness, know that he is in thee: as also when the desire of many things, and of the best meats, and of drunkenness; when the love of what belongs to others, pride and much speaking, ambition, and the like things come upon thee. When therefore these things arise in thy heart, know that the angel of iniquity is with thee. Seeing therefore thou knowest his works, depart from them, and give no credit to him; because his works are evil, and become not the servants of God. Here therefore thou hast the works of both these angels. Understand now, and believe the angel of righteousness, because his instruction is good. For let a man be never so happy, yet if the thoughts of the other angel rise in his heart, that man or woman must needs sin. But let a man or woman be never so wicked, if the works of the angel of righteousness come into his heart, that man or woman must needs do some good. Thou seest therefore how it is good to follow the angel of righteousness. If therefore thou shalt follow him, and submit to his works, thou shalt live unto God. And as many as shall submit to his works, shall live also unto God.”*

In the language of this father, then, we must attribute whatever a man does to his good or evil angel; just as the ancient Roman would have imputed it to his good or evil genius. There is nothing of this in the Bible. The places in Psalm 34: 7 and Matt. 18: 10, to which the fathers referred, certainly have no such meaning. The former text, “The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them,” does not speak of a single angel, nor of a single in-

* *Hermas*, B. II. Command 6.

dividual, nor of a whole course of life. The singular, *angel*, is a collective noun ; for one angel could not be said to encamp round about any thing. They that fear the Lord are all the pious in general ; and the time or occasion referred to, is the season of danger and distress. The meaning of the text, divested of its poetic form, is simply this, that God employs the ministry of angels to deliver his people from affliction and danger. The text in Matthew says, that the infant children of believers ; or, if you please, the least among the disciples of Christ ; whom the ministers of the church might be inclined to neglect on account of their supposed insignificance, are in such estimation in heaven, that the angels who stand before God do not esteem it below their dignity to minister to them ; it does not mean that one of those angels is assigned to each of these little ones ; for in that case, if the number of those angels be seven, only seven such infants could be provided for. The idea of a guardian angel, or of two contending angels, striving for the control of an individual, is not derived from the Scriptures, but from the fancies of the Jews ; or, rather, from those of Gentiles : and it is one among the many proofs of the incompetency of the fathers, even of the earliest among them, to serve as guides in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. The superstitions of the age, and the philosophy of the Grecian schools, held too strong a hold of their minds, to be sufficiently kept from mixing with the instructions of the sacred text, and polluting its purer streams even where they issued from their fountain.

The world of spirits is not, as many think, at a great distance from us, in other regions of the universe : it is wherever the material world is ; we are in the midst of it. We are separated from it only by the gross matter with which we are now united ; and when we shall be divested of these bodies, we shall be in another world, without being in another place. We shall then perceive objects of which we can now have no perception, because our senses are not adapted to them. The material world also will be to us a wholly different thing from what it is ; inasmuch as its impressions will be made upon wholly different organs. It may be presumed, there will then be no such ideas of extension, of solidity, of space, etc., as we now have ; nor shall we receive either pleasure or pain from the same objects which produce them now. In a word, we shall be as the angels of God, and the world will be to us what it

now is to them. The world of spirits, therefore, is not another place, but another state of being. We are now in the presence of God, and of Christ, and of angels; and we shall see them as soon as we shall have passed through our coming change. Of this truth Jesus gave intimations to his disciples, when he appeared to them, and disappeared, without locomotion, and knew what they had spoken in his absence; when he told them, "Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them;" and when he said, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." What the Scripture says about a heaven above us, and a *sheol* or *hades* below us, is accommodated to our capacity and previous conceptions. When Jesus ascended into heaven, he did not quit our world; but he withdrew from our state of being into another, and adapted the manner of his withdrawing to the conceptions and the mode of thinking of the mass of mankind. Christ is with us still; his angels are near us; we are in the immediate presence of God. If we sin, we cannot be hid; if we do well, we are seen in so doing; if we are in distress, or in danger, our situation is observed, and our help is nigh at hand. In the church on earth we "are come to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel," Heb. 12: 22—24. "Wherefore, seeing we are compassed about by such witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith; who, for the joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God," Heb. 12: 1, 2. The Father's house is the great universe: our world is but one of its mansions: there are others besides this one; and all of them are inhabited by the innumerable family of Jehovah, the common Father of all.

ARTICLE VI.

REVIEW OF MISS MARTINEAU'S WORKS.

Society in America, by Harriet Martineau, author of "Illustrations of Political Economy." In two volumes. New York and London, 1837.

Retrospect of Western Travel, by Harriet Martineau, author of "Society in America," "Illustrations of Political Economy," etc. In two volumes. London and New York, 1838.

SOME of our readers may wonder why we have not sooner noticed this lady, who has made herself so conspicuous of late years both in Great Britain and in this country; and some may wonder why we notice her at all. To this latter portion of readers, we would say, by way of apology, that after going over the 815 pages of her "*Society*," we had come to the conclusion of leaving her work to the praises and the censures of those more immediately concerned. But she has since put forth these other two volumes about America. And as this last work was not premeditated by her, (as she tells us,) nor expected by any body, neither we nor she can tell how many more we may yet see. We have therefore thought it proper to be at the trouble of giving such of our readers as have not perused the books, some brief notice of their character, and more especially of their *moral* and *religious* character. This is what more directly concerns the mass of our readers, and what is the most likely to exert either a good or a pernicious influence in our land. Some recent transactions, too, in respect to the assertion of "female rights," seem to render a brief notice of the present champion of these rights, both appropriate and timely. We say the *present* champion, because Fanny Wright, like some others, when becoming entangled in the bonds of wedlock, has ceased to lead the van in this enterprise.

Miss Martineau has been called a Scotch lady, though she occasionally speaks of herself, in company with others, as "we English." And saving here and there a word of bad English that she uses, and some severe censures on the fastidiousness and insolence of English travellers in this country, (for which we cannot blame her,) we have noticed nothing in these works

to lead us to suspect her more northern birth. After acquiring considerable celebrity as a writer of tales on political economy, etc. she came to this country, a strong republican, and with the expectation of seeing much to admire in this more free and natural state of society. And her readiness to admire and praise, is generally very conspicuous. Sometimes, indeed, she is delighted with what last of all we should expect a delicate and tasteful female to admire. For instance, she is frequent in her praises of the log cabins in the West, as being not only comfortable but very "neat." She praises also continually our tavern-keepers, stage-coach drivers, waggon drivers, etc. especially when they exhibit their manly independence and give free scope to their mother wit—though perhaps at her own expense. In all such matters, she rejoices in showing herself a perfect contrast to her more fastidious brethren who have come over the water to see us. If the coach breaks down, or the waggon founders in the mud, it is rather an amusement than a vexation. If the driver is stern, or a waiter is insolent, she knows how to put them in good humor. In all such things, we greatly admire her good nature, and readily commend her example to all travellers. In higher matters, too, she is often ready with her ample commendation, though it seems sometimes more of a studied and formal commendation, and not to spring quite so unbidden from the heart. We have therefore no complaint to make of her bad disposition towards us, though possibly some of her English friends may censure her for occasionally praising us through malice towards them. Her prepossessions seem all in our favor; and where she abuses us, as she does abuse us most sadly in some respects, it is generally for things in which we resemble, if not the whole christian world, at least the British nation. The only exceptions which now occur to our recollection, are those rather numerous passages in which she decries us as destitute of all knowledge of philosophy, (by which she means one knows not what,) and those other passages in which she represents our climate as most deleterious to health, and our slavery as the worst of all things.

Nor did she dispense her praises and her censures without being at pains to learn something of the facts in question. In this respect, she stands again as a signal contrast to many who have just seen our shores, and then returned to report of us wonders equally astonishing to the people on both sides of the Atlantic. Sometimes, indeed, she tells a very strange story.

For instance, that while travelling near Saratoga Springs, "a large white snake made a prodigious spring from the grass at the driver, who jumped down and stoned it." But strange stories, as to matters of fact, are not frequent in her pages. And as to her diligence in seeing this new world, and hearing what she could, (for she is too deaf to hear without an ear-trumpet,) we presume she has rarely been surpassed by any masculine wanderer. She traversed nearly our whole country, and in almost every direction, and by every species of conveyance, from the steam-boat to the rudest waggon. In the course of the two years she was here, she visited most of the States and most of the important places and curiosities; now sailing on our rivers; now, crossing our mountains; now, off on our western lakes; now, in our halls of justice or of legislation; and now, among the Indian tribes. She consorted with all kinds of people, and seemed well pleased and at home every where—except among orthodox Christians. Of these, she seems to have seen but few, and to have learned but little. And of the few whom she did see, or deigns to notice, she generally shows her sovereign contempt or her bitter hatred. Dr. Beecher she hates the worst of all; at whose house she very drily tells us she was entertained; and whom, in another place, she would most absurdly represent as the incendiary who caused the burning of the Charlestown convent, because he happened to preach against the Roman Catholics the Sabbath before it was burnt—which preaching probably not one of the incendiary mob attended or ever heard of. The catholics she honors and defends, not so much because she loves them, as because she hates those who most oppose their superstitions. The exceptions to her general enmity to the orthodox, seem chiefly confined to a few individuals who displayed the sovereign merit, with her, a zeal for anti-slavery movements. So far as religion is concerned, Unitarians were her chosen companions; and she often reiterates the declaration, "I am a Unitarian." Still it was not religion in any form, nor religious people of any stamp, that most engaged her attention. Civil and political matters and political men were her delight. Full of zeal for acquiring knowledge of men and things like these, and quite as zealous on her darling topics of anti-slavery, female rights, and a freedom from all religious, and many moral restraints, she traversed the length and breadth of our land, putting herself on a level with the highest, and not scrupling to

minge familiarly with the lowest. "I visited," says she, "almost every kind of institution — prisons — insane and other hospitals — literary and scientific institutions ; the plantations of the south ; the factories of the north ; and the farms of the west. I lived in houses which might be called palaces, in log-houses, and in a farm house. I saw weddings and christenings. I was present at orations, at land sales, and in the slave market. I was in frequent attendance on the supreme court and in the senate. Above all, I was received into the bosom of many families, not as a stranger, but as a daughter or sister. I was acquainted with almost every eminent senator and representative,—and was on intimate terms with some of the judges of the supreme court. I enjoyed the hospitality of the President and several of the heads of departments. It would be nearly impossible to relate whom I knew, during my travels. Nearly every eminent man in politics, science, and literature, and almost every distinguished woman, could grace my list. I travelled among several tribes of Indians, and spent months in the southern States, with negroes ever at my heels."

Truly, she must have been diligent for those two years ! And as she saw every body and every thing, and as she also knows every thing, so she has undertaken to treat of every thing. Not only does she tell her countrymen of all she saw and thought while here, both respecting us and them, but she tells us of all we ought to be and to have here. Her first work is not at all in the common shape of travels. Generally it follows neither the course of her routes nor the order of time ; but is divided into *parts*, *chapters*, and *sections*, according to the nature of the weighty matters which her philosophic and masculine genius saw fit to discuss.

When treating on civil and political institutions, her remarks are often good, though frequently betraying a propensity to an extravagant and speculative, rather than a practical system of government. She too much resembles the theorists of the first French revolution, always ready to utter the cry of liberty and equality. While she heartily commends the degree of republicanism to which we have already attained, she thinks we shall be far in the rear of perfection so long as negroes and women are debarred from a seat in Congress and from the presidential chair.

But it is when treating of distinguished *men*, and especially of *political characters*, that her genius blazes forth in its strongest

effulgence. Here she is truly at home, and as one among her peers. Nor can we much wonder, after reading what she has said, often with so much justness as well as power, about individual statesmen, judges, presidents, and generals, that such a woman should be deeply afflicted at finding what she regards as a very paltry distinction between her and her brethren, the distinction of sex, placed as an insuperable barrier to her ever thundering in the senate or giving destiny to empires. Here we think is the one commanding trait in her character, and the real clue to all she has so strenuously and so strangely urged in favor of what she regards as "the rights of woman." Had she been born a man, or had she early assumed the virile garb, as a few of the female brethren on the page of history have done, we should have heard nothing from her on *such* "rights." One of the early Platonizing fathers, full of his aërial visions, maintained the doctrine, that each human soul forms its own body to its own liking. Such a theory could not live an hour in our day. A single personage of this caste, would suffice as a living demonstration of its falseness. For never would such a spirit have chosen the female form for its habitation!

And now, as we have insensibly come upon the topic, dismissing all else which she has so manfully said on politics, men, agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and a vast variety of other things, let us turn, for a while, to her section on the "Political Non-existence of Women." This is the seventh and closing section of a long chapter which she denominates the "Morals of Politics." And truly it seems a very appropriate ending of the climax to much of the political morality she had been teaching. But the reader must here have a chance to judge for himself respecting this portion of her political morality. As we would neither distort her statements, nor maim this champion's arguments, we will quote the essential parts of both.

The corollaries which ever and anon she bolts forth upon us as the inevitable conclusions from her premises, are as fearful in their import as they are startling in their aspect. She thus begins this notable section on the "*Political Non-existence of Women.*"

"One of the fundamental principles announced in the Declaration of Independence is, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. How can the political condition of women be reconciled with this?"

"Governments in the United States have power to tax women who

hold property ; to divorce them from their husbands ; to fine, imprison, and execute them for certain offences. Whence do these governments derive their powers ? They are not 'just,' as they are not derived from the consent of the women thus governed."—*Society*, Vol. i. p. 148.

"The democratic principle condemns all this as wrong ; and requires the equal political representation of all rational beings. Children, idiots, and criminals, during the season of sequestration, are the only fair exceptions.

"The case is so plain that I might close it here ; but it is interesting to inquire how so obvious a decision has been so evaded as to leave to women no political rights whatever. The question has been asked, from time to time, in more countries than one, how obedience to the laws can be required of women, when no woman has, either actually or virtually, given any assent to any law. No plausible answer has, as far as I can discover, been offered ; for the good reason, that no plausible answer can be devised. The most principled democratic writers on government have on this subject sunk into fallacies, as disgraceful as any advocate of despotism has adduced. In fact, they have thus sunk from being, for the moment, advocates of despotism. Jefferson in America, and James Mill at home, subside, for the occasion, to the level of the author of the Emperor of Russia's Catechism for the young Poles."—*Ibid.* p. 149.

She then goes on to quote Mr. Jefferson's reasons for excluding women from the political deliberations of our government, even if it were "a pure democracy in which all the inhabitants should meet together to transact their business," viz., "to prevent the depravation of morals and the ambiguity of issue." To this, she replies :—"Woman's lack of will and of property is more like the true cause of her exclusion from the representation, than that which is set down against her. As if there could be no means of conducting public affairs but by promiscuous meetings ! As if there would be more danger in promiscuous meetings for political business than in such meetings for worship, for oratory, for music, for dramatic entertainments,—for any of the thousand transactions of civilized life ! The plea is not worth another word."

The steps by which she hastens from the house of God to the theatre, are indeed very nimbly taken. She bounds with a light heart and an unquaking conscience. And truly if the temple of Jehovah and that of Belial, are alike safe to female purity and congenial to female modesty, we perhaps ought not to deny that the town house and the halls of legislation and the camp will be equally safe ! We presume Miss Martineau was

never *sensible* of any injury by being present as a spectator in such places. But to go on with her plea.

To the common and sound arguments, that women are virtually represented by the men, since their interests are identical with those of their husbands, brothers, fathers, and sons, she replies: "The true democratic principle is, that no person's interests can be, or can be ascertained to be, identical with those of any other person. This allows the exclusion of none but incapables." And again, she just adds: "The interests of women who have fathers and husbands, can never be identical with theirs, while there is a necessity for laws to protect women against their husbands and fathers. This statement is not worth another word." Thus it is that she settles that important point; and then passes to the alleged incompatibility of political duties with the other duties of women. On this she claims, that "women are the best judges." And then to the fact that even the women have virtually decided that such duties are incompatible, by their ready and universal acquiescence, she affirms that "such acquiescence proves nothing but the degradation of the injured party." But she must here speak for herself.

"It is pleaded that half of the human race does acquiesce in the decision of the other half, as to their rights and duties. And in some instances, not only of submission, but of acquiescence, there are. Forty years ago, the women of New Jersey went to the poll, and voted, at state elections. The general term, "inhabitants," stood unqualified;—as it will again, when the true democratic principle comes to be fully understood. A motion was made to correct the inadvertence; and it was done, as a matter of course; without any appeal, as far as I could learn, from the persons about to be injured. Such acquiescence proves nothing but the degradation of the injured party. It inspires the same emotions of pity as the supplication of the freed slave who kneels to his master to restore him to slavery, that he may have his animal wants supplied, without being troubled with human rights and duties. Acquiescence like this is an argument which cuts the wrong way for those who use it."—pp.151, 152.

But, really, we fear these tyrannic lords of creation will not feel the keen edge of this argument cutting back on themselves quite so fatally as the kind lady thinks they ought to feel it. We fear they will continue stupidly to say, (if they say anything more about it,) that these good women of New Jersey, when they had for a while enjoyed all this golden freedom and

had received all the exaltation of character which its coveted dignity could confer, voluntarily preferred themselves to resign the dignity, not thinking the glory a reward for the burden. As they then had half the power in their own hands, they of course could not be deposed from this power by the men, without some good chance of successful resistance, if not of actual victory and a sole monopoly. The fact, then, that all this was done, not only without their resistance, but with their perfect "acquiescence," we fear will be urged as an unanswerable proof, that the mass of women have too much modesty and good sense to accept and retain so masculine a vocation, even should it be conferred on them by the generosity, or (as in this case,) by the oversight of their brethren. Miss M., as it seems from the above quotation, thought those of New Jersey too stupid and slavish, to have any heart for the lofty boon, and pours forth her "emotions of pity" accordingly. But this is no strange thing in Miss M. for, while she combats so bravely for women's rights and tells us what they might be if not trampled like slaves in the dust, she uniformly exhibits the most absolute contempt of the women of actual existence, as we may elsewhere show.

But we must proceed with what she has further to say respecting this acquiescence of women in their political non-existence. The reader will please to brace his nerves before coming to the middle of the next paragraph in order.

"But this acquiescence is only partial; and, to give any semblance of strength to the plea, the acquiescence must be complete. I, for one, do not acquiesce, I declare that whatever obedience I yield to the laws of the society in which I live is a matter between, not the community and myself, but my judgment and my will. Any punishment inflicted on me for the breach of the laws, I should regard as so much gratuitous injury: for to those laws I have never, actually or virtually, assented. I know that there are women in England who agree with me in this—I know that there are women in America who agree with me in this. The plea of acquiescence is invalidated by us."—p. 152.

This is political morality of a pretty thorough-going cast. Whether her predecessors, Mary Woolstonecraft, Fanny Wright, or any of the rest of the genus who have contended for "the rights of women," would go further than this, we cannot now stop to inquire. No woman, then, is now bound, nor ever was bound, (except those in New Jersey for a while,) to keep any law of the land which does not suit her "judgment" and her

“will”! The poor sorry male voters have got to keep all the laws, whether they vote for them or not. And if they abuse their wives, they must go to the state prison, or the gallows for it. But if a woman’s will and judgment dictate abuse, a breach of connubial fidelity, or even the cup of poison for her husband, she is her own sole judge in all such matters, and it will be “so much gratuitous injury,” for the laws to touch her. Did the women of New Jersey think of all this when they so acquiescently yielded the honors of legislation? It is quite possible they did, provided they have the cunning as well as the other attributes of the slave which Miss M. imputes to them! But in our youth, Dr. Morse’s larger Geography taught us to think very differently of the females of that State, as ‘being distinguished both for their beauty and for the higher graces.’ And if such are the doctrines of morality that do actually and naturally spring up with a predilection for what is now meant by “the rights of women,” (and we verily fear they are,) we think those women gave a signal demonstration that they possessed, (not the debasement nor low cunning of the slave,) but those higher graces, when they so complacently retired from the ballot-box. Not, however, that the mass of all the women in any other State or any other part of Christendom, would not do the same, were the option imposed upon them. They blush now most deeply, (all but the very few who have no blushes,) when they read such a work as the one before us, from one of their own sex.

But this doctrine of non-voters being absolved from all legal restraint, is too serious a matter to be dismissed without some further notice. Not only are all women thus absolved, but likewise all children and minors. They have no hand in making laws. The inmates of prisons must also be absolved, unless they have the ballot box sent to their cells. They must also be permitted to walk forth to the discharge of civil offices, should there be rogues enough out of doors to elect them either as senators or as hog-reeves. Children, too, are no longer to be taught to obey their parents, as they “have never, actually or virtually assented to the laws” of God or man, enjoining such obedience, any more than Miss Martineau has assented to the laws of England or America. God commands children to obey their parents, and subjects to obey their rulers. But this is no rule for our author, as we may possibly find room to show more fully. He also commands wives to be subject to their

husbands. And as the strongest illustrations of this command are found in the Old Testament, perhaps we have here one reason why Miss Martineau holds that inspired portion of the ancient records in such contempt as to think it a scandal that a verse of it should be inscribed on the tombstone of so enlightened a man as Dr. Priestley.

But neither is this all. Two other large classes are absolved by her doctrine from all legal control. The slaves in all the States, together with the free blacks in most of the States, constitute one of these classes. They have no voice in making laws, and of course are no more bound to keep them than are women. Nor was this bearing of her doctrine hidden from her view, as is amply manifest from her whole strain. But this, we fear our southern brethren will say, is preaching the doctrine of slave insurrection, and that in no qualified way. Nay, they will regard it as a thousand times worse. For what is a revolt, with its consequent temporary calamities, compared with every negro, bond and free, being left to follow his "own judgment and will," unbridled, and forever, and in all things? unless the whites see fit to put the whole power of the State into the hands of such a majority of voters. This, we say, we fear the southern people, (who so hospitably entertained Miss Martineau with their "negroes ever at her heels,") will be perverse enough to assert. And if asserted, we see not how she, and the people at the north who side with her, can defend themselves against the frequent charge of incendiary publications. Much sooner should we undertake to defend the right of a general insurrection where success and subsequent order could be hoped, than this wholesale principle of absolute licentiousness.

But there is another class every where found, who, for a much stronger reason, should be absolved, viz. voters who actually *oppose* the laws that are framed and oppose the men who frame them. How can such be bound by laws which, so far from "assenting to," they actually oppose? We shall have anarchy enough, surely, when this *upas* has spread its branches over the land! Nor will the coveted universality of suffrage, if gained, remedy the evil. The man who intends to be a villain, has only to show his timely opposition to laws which he does not wish to keep, (though he may be glad to have the makers bound by them,) and he is forever absolved. Would even Miss Martineau like to be thus exposed to the *lawless*

part of our community while travelling among us? Or would she think one who should will and judge it best to rob her, quite fairly absolved, on his declaring he had not assented to our laws?

It is our own humble opinion, that Miss Martineau and some others are in a serious mistake as to the foundation of our government, and of all government; and that, while God and reason have left every nation to choose and to alter their forms of government at pleasure, both God and reason bind all to be "subject to the powers that be," and to obey all their righteous laws, though they have had no hand in making the laws.

But possibly we have been a little too charitable towards the fair sex, as found in Christendom, in supposing so large a portion of them blush at the sight of such a section as the one we are now upon. For Miss M. tells us, with overaweing emphasis, respecting this doctrine, "I know that there are women in England who agree with me in this—I know that there are women in America who agree with me in this." Who they are in England, we may not soon learn. But who some of those are in America, we are perhaps in a sufficiently fair way of learning in the course of public transactions on female rights, even if Miss M. should not think it best to name them in her next work. But we are determined still to enjoy the pleasure of our charitable judgment of the sex, till we see more indications of the prevalence of such doctrine among them, notwithstanding her strong assurance as to the portentous matter of fact in regard to some of them, and her declaration that "it is the true democratic principle which can never be seriously controverted, and only for a short time evaded."

Were we now seriously apprehensive that such a time is at hand, or that any portion of our women, (except a few possessed by monomania for a season,) could desire it, we would argue with them on the absurdity of supposing, that in such a land of christian civilization, the men can ever possibly imagine, that they have any separate interests to maintain in opposition to the women. And if they could themselves imagine the men to have any such interest, or any disposition to assert it, we would ask them whether the weaker sex will stand much chance of success in attempting, in *Miss Martineau's way*, to gain their proper sway among the tyrannic lords, already so entrenched in power. But our discreet women would deem their understandings insulted, were we to enter seriously on any such arguments.

We would just add here, that it is not merely in this chapter, but everywhere in her books, that she speaks of our women with mingled pity and contempt, as poor, enslaved beings, sunk in ignorance of almost every thing but a debasing and superstitious kind of religion, bereft of their rights, and with "their morals crushed." This last phrase she reiterates again and again. Since writing the last sentence, we have turned to the book, to see if our expression is not too strong; and opening to her chapter on women, we find the phrase no less than four times on the first eight pages, and always left with a dubious sense. And again and again does she reiterate, in the same chapter, that "marriage is the only thing left open to women," and for this, they are but miserably fitted—to sustain its burdens, and be companions to the men. But we must give an entire sentence or two, in order to show that our representation is not too strong. Our eye has just glanced on another passage containing some of her favorite expressions about both our men and our women. "Men are ungentle, tyrannical. They abuse the right of the strongest, however they may veil the abuse with indulgence. They want the magnanimity to discern woman's human rights; and they crush her morals rather than allow them. Women are, as might be anticipated, weak, ignorant, and subservient." And on the same page, she adds:

"If it were not for the external prosperity of the country, the injured half of its society would probably obtain justice sooner than in any country of Europe. But the prosperity of America is a circumstance unfavorable to its women. It will be long before they are put to the proof as to what they are capable of thinking and doing: a proof to which hundreds, perhaps thousands of English-women have been put by adversity, and the result of which is a remarkable improvement in their social condition, even within the space of ten years. Persecution for opinion, punishment for all manifestations of intellectual and moral strength, are still as common as women who have opinions and who manifest strength: but some things are easy, and many are possible of achievement, to women of ordinary powers, which it would have required genius to accomplish but a few years ago."—Vol. ii. pp. 235, 236.

The women, then, must pray for a curse on the land, if they would hope most speedily to surmount such tyranny. *How* this would help them, we cannot conceive, as we had supposed the tendency of prosperity, in a community like ours, pecu-

liarily favorable in relieving the burdens and promoting the education, the comfort, and the dignity of females. Nor do we know precisely the kind of adversity which has come down so propitiously on "thousands of English women;" unless it be something which has sent an uncommon number of them into the fields to toil, amid dust and heat, by the side of their husbands, for daily bread. And this, on the whole, we suppose to be the true interpretation, because Miss Martineau elsewhere informs us, that she has no objection to their joining in such toils; and because this course, where it did not prostrate the delicate frame, would foster the manly energy which she so much desires in the heroines she would train up for the coming crisis, and likewise for the highest state of human perfectibility! This would increase the small number of "such brave women" as she informs us, in this same paragraph, "there are in the United States, scattered among the multitudes."

With this brief and incidental notice of the absurd mingling of men and women in the same employments, we were just going to dismiss the unwelcome topic. But, on second thought, we are persuaded we should thus be guilty of taking but too slight a notice of what appears really to form one of the fundamental changes contemplated by Miss Martineau and her coadjutors. She and others complain loudly of the artificial distinctions between the sexes in their employments, not only in regard to political offices, but in the common affairs of life. And she admires the state of things among the pioneers of the west, in their log cabins, as an approach towards the coming perfection. Perhaps, too, she has contemplated with delight the picture of rustic simplicity as it existed in Europe in the early and middle ages, when women were allowed to take care of themselves. And as she is peculiarly fond of the French freedom in philosophy, in morals, and in religion, we presume she has thought of the freedom of occupation her sex still enjoy in some departments of that fair land—perhaps the land of her forefathers. We shall therefore be pardoned, if not praised, for extracting some description of this "liberty and equality" among the sexes, as it reigns there. The picture is drawn by M. Aime Martin, in a recent work on "the Education of Mothers," quoted in the New York Observer, of May last. The author may not indeed agree with Miss Martineau as to the *moral bearing* of the picture, but being on the spot, he has at least had the best opportunities for a correct delineation.

“The great misfortune of our villages is the degradation of women by the labors which belong to men.—In their early infancy they drive the flocks, and gather the harvest. While young girls, an instinct of coquetry and the foresight of their mothers banishes them from the ruder fatigues of agriculture; but as soon as they are married, every thing is changed; they abandon the house and follow their husbands into the fields. You see them bent to the earth like machinery, or loaded with enormous burdens like beasts. There are countries in France, I do not mean Africa, where they are tackled to the plough like the ox and the ass. Then their skin becomes wrinkled, their features become masculine, and they fall into a premature decrepitude, more hideous than that of old age. But while they are performing the labor of the men, the labors of the woman—those labors which soften all others—remain unknown or neglected. Nothing can be more dirty, more unhealthy, than the interior of a cottage.—Often hens, ducks and hogs dispute the possession of its damp soil. The door opens into the mud, and the windows, when there are any, open upon the dung heap. Here it is, however, in a mud hole, like the hut of a savage, in the midst of the grunting of animals and their offensive exhalations, that every evening, two human beings, a male and female, come to rest themselves from their fatigues. There no one welcomes them, nothing agreeable meets their eye, the table is empty and the hearth is cold. And here too, other labors await the woman, and before thinking of her husband's supper, and the care of her children, she must take care of the stable and give food to the beasts.

“If we are asked for examples, we will cite whole provinces, the richest as well as the poorest of France. Perigord, where the women grovel in a state of dirt and degradation, which reacts upon the whole family—Picardy and Limousin, where, repulsed to the last point, as an inferior race, they serve their husbands at the table, without ever placing themselves by their side—Brise, where they are machines, beasts of burden and labor—Basse, and Bretagne, finally, where the men, women, and children, reduced to an almost savage state, live, pell mell, in the same mud, eat the same black corn in the same manger, with their sheep and swine. Everywhere the degradation of the woman is the proof of the brutality of the man, and everywhere the brutalization of the man is the reaction of the degradation of the woman. Do not offer them comfort, they will repulse it as a strange or useless thing. To desire comfort it is necessary to understand it, and ages have passed over their cabins, without leaving there any thoughts but those of labor and misery.

Of the condition and character of the man, where these notions prevail, Mr. Martin informs us :

“He is ignorant of comfort, the charm of caresses, and even the power of love. His children tremble before him—his wife dreads

the vigor of his arm. The adversary, and not the protector of these feeble beings, he knows no law but force. The last reason of the peasant in his cabin, as well as in the fields, is the weight of his fists."

Is this a picture of paradise? we may humbly ask of Miss M., or is it drawn from some portion of Pandemonium! Nor ought such a compasser of sea and land to "catch the manners living as they rise," to object to any picture taken from real life. She may say, (provided she does not indeed quite like the whole of this delineation), that according to her "philosophy," things ought not to be just so. But will she say that they are *not so*? and that they *will not be* so everywhere, and always, when, like these French people, the men turn cooks with the women, and the women turn farmers with the men? Or will her philosophy prevent the evil? and change "the ridiculous into the sublime," as she somewhere hints? and make all a paradise? But have not the French themselves already had enough of precisely this same philosophy of equal rights, and no restraints and no religion? and that on no small scale? Was their enthronement of a woman as the goddess of reason, nothing to the purpose in such an actual experiment?

But let us now hear a word further from this sobered but powerful French writer, as to the remedy he would propose. After speaking of the better education of females, he says;—

"The second means, the necessary consequence of the first, consists in restoring to the peasant women the occupations of their sex, in returning to the laws of nature. This simple change is a complete revolution. In returning to her own labors, the woman recovers her beauty, she regains her power. Occupied with things less gross, her tastes are purified, her manners are softened, she seeks neatness, she understands comfort, and the day is at hand when all her thoughts all her desires reach the heart of her husband. The delicacy of the woman is the most powerful enemy of the barbarity of the man."

This remedy, so simple in its nature and so powerfully presented in this brief paragraph of Mr. Martin, Miss Martineau may, indeed, declare to be the very disease itself. Still we think it will be very difficult for her or for any of our wandering female lecturers on this subject, to meet the facts and their legitimate conclusions. The whole progress of christian civilization has been a gradual and steady advance in relieving woman from the rude and heavy burdens which man's frame alone

is adequate to bear. The very structure of the delicate female body, points to such a division of labors. And the structure of the more delicate mind, with its exquisite sensibilities, doubly demands the same. Destroy these sensibilities, (as destroy them you will by sending her to herd with men abroad in the care of brutes), and you make her a brute. She may, indeed, become a lioness; but she is no longer a woman. With these sensibilities destroyed, or even greatly perverted, woman sinks far below what man is capable of reaching in debasement. Hence not only the fish-women of Billingsgate, but female authors, too, are found to do and to say things which put the whole world of men in amazement. God likewise has ordained a separate sphere for women. He forbade the two sexes to wear the same dress. And so far as the divine ordinance has been followed, it has been uniformly well for both woman and man. But the present plan is, to reverse the whole process which God has commanded, and which the whole progress of christian civilization has shown to be benign.

And why is all this reversal enjoined upon us, at this late day? Because, says Miss M., men are still tyrants. To this Mr. Martin, and all history, reply, the men would be ten fold more tyrannical, should society take this retrograde step. 'Nothing but the heft of fists, could then decide questions on female rights.' And Miss Martineau seems almost to admit the plea, when she urges this course in order to raise up "brave women" who can vindicate their rights!

'But no,' says this brave woman; 'the merits of the case are not touched. Nor does the whole volume of history afford a single lesson on the main remedy proposed. Women are to be trained to bravery and hardihood, not for the purpose of meeting men with their fists, but for meeting them at the polls, and on the floor of Congress. They must fight their way to an equality of civil and political rights. And when once admitted to such equality, they will no longer suffer from the tyranny of the men. This remedy has never yet been tried; but the democracy of America is soon to be so purified, as to present the sovereign and eternal cure.'

Right glad shall we be to hail so illustrious a morning! The women, we readily and mournfully confess, have often and grievously suffered from the individual violence of the stronger men, and likewise from the general customs prevalent among rude and especially unchristian nations. And if to spread the right

of a strictly universal suffrage, is to cure all this evil, we confess it will be a grand consummation,—however it may shake our faith in the Bible as a book of wise ordinances! The women, in the mean time, we must take it for granted, will not abuse the men, however high their political ascendant.

But may we here be permitted just to inquire, in a single word, whether the omnipotence of this remedy is quite so absolutely certain as to make it wise for us, without any further thought, at once to overturn the whole structure of civilized society? occupation? laws? government? all? Surely, in a momentous case, and where we have not the lights of history to guide us, we may be suffered to pause for at least a second thought, as to the soundness of those abstract principles on which so much is to be hazarded. We will stop the chariot of so glorious a reform, no longer than just to put a single question or two. Suppose then universal suffrage, (the grand catholicon,) is obtained; and that a two-fisted Irishman and his brave wife both go to the polls. Is it quite so certain that when they return, (half drunk, perhaps, for Miss M. is not zealous for temperance reforms,) this Irishman will not abuse his wife at all? We confess we do not exactly see the foundation of this certainty. No more laws for the protection of wives are to be made by the women, for these laws are now as strong as they can be; and if not, the men are ready to make them stronger. How then is the end to be promoted by the means?—And still just one more question. If the good women of New Jersey actually found *their* husbands becoming so much more kind, (for here is a little light of history, after all, on the point,) how came they so tamely to resign their franchise? If they were thus actually getting free from the original curse, “he shall rule over thee,” why have they not at least let the world know it, for the benefit of some future and braver women who may grasp their rights with a firmer nerve? If this had been done, or if even the abstract theory itself were more unquestionable, we confess we should not be so much surprised as we now are at the female authors and lecturers of our day, on this general subject. Nor should we be quite so much surprised at the acquiescence and coöperation of some chivalrous philanthropists, now conspicuous before the public. We could even look with less of religious amazement at the virtual repeal of a divine ordinance, touching the matrimonial obligation in his own case, said to have been recently made by a Rev. gentleman when in the solemn act of

espousing an enlightened wife ! Could a minister of the gospel be afraid he should abuse such a wife ? Or did he fear he could not enforce the required subjection ? Or did he think her so superangelic as not to need God's law ? Or did he do this, and has it been published through the land, as an example to other men who cannot be trusted with so high a prerogative as that of ruling their own household ! Be all this as it may, we cannot but think it a pretty bold, (not to say anti-bible,) act, in a minister of the gospel. We have always supposed it a part of our christian duty, when officially solemnizing the bands of marriage, to propound the mutual promise to the parties "to conduct themselves towards each other in this sacred relation, in all respects as God in his holy word requires." If interrupted in the ceremony with such an exception to God's requirements, we see not how we could in conscience have proceeded ; and especially so in the case of a bishop, whom God has expressly commanded to "rule his own house." Did we not regard so radical an innovation in the matter of marriage solemnities, as a very serious affair in principle, (whatever may prove to be the practical results to these individuals,) we should by no means have suffered our pen to digress upon so unwelcome a theme.

But it is now high time to proceed to other topics in Miss Martineau's prolific books. And to what topic, in this connection, can we more naturally turn, than to some brief inquiry as to the new laws which the newly elevated legislators will have to propose for the relief of themselves, or the benefit of their brethren ? Miss M. has not indeed seen fit to give us the outline of any very extended code of reform laws. She has, however, most unequivocally shown us what one of the first and leading enactments must be, provided her political morality is to be the guide. And here, the gentle reader will again please to brace his nerves. "It is clear," she says, in her section on Marriage, "that the sole business which legislation has with marriage, is with the arrangement of property ; to guard the reciprocal rights of the children of the marriage and the community ;" and she thinks it ought to be here and in England, as it is in Zurich, where, she says, "the parties are married by a form ; and have liberty to divorce themselves, without any appeal to law, on showing that they have legally provided for the children of the marriage." We can assure our readers that there is here no mistake as to the fair presentation of her views

on the perfect freedom of divorce. We could quote the whole section, if needful, to show that she would have every man left by the laws to "put away his wife for any cause" he pleases, and at any day; and so of the wife with her husband. And this is one of the grand things which she sees fit most distinctly to specify, by which a millennium is to be produced in the conjugal relation, and in all that depends on this relation in families and nations! Verily it *was* needless for her to go a single step further in showing what reforms she would have in legislation. And why need we go any further, and attempt to show from what she has elsewhere said, the nature of the other reforms we might expect, should her notions of liberty and equality gain the ascendancy she so confidently predicts as at hand. However roundly she may assert that there are women in America and England that think with her, we can never believe till we witness the fact, that she can bring forward any sane woman in this country who is not utterly abandoned in morals, that would not shudder at the thought of such legal licentiousness! How far it may be wise for any of them to follow such a law maker, or to adopt principles which she regards as a part of her entire system of female emancipation, it may be well for them in due time to consider. Such legislation might possibly gratify *men* of Abner Kneeland's school, or the early French revolutionists; but how any *christian woman*, or any virtuous woman in a christian land, can think of following such a banner a single step, is among the hard problems of our astonishing age!

Not that we are any more opposed to the proper cultivation of energy, fortitude, activity, and independent thought, in women, than to the fostering of those more delicate and charming and humanizing graces by which, whenever wisely fostered, they have always so extensively ruled and softened and blessed the stronger half of the rational creation. Nor would we deny them, as some have done, the vocation of teaching youth, especially of their own sex. Many, in this way, are now justly regarded as among the greatest benefactors of their age. We have no sympathy with that sickly philosophy which would banish all females from so becoming, so christian, so eminently useful an employment. Nor would we forbid them to meddle with the severer studies. Such studies are, of late years much encouraged in our more evangelical female schools—of which Miss Martineau seems to know nothing. We are as strongly

opposed as she can be, 'to leaving nothing open to the pursuit of young ladies but matrimony.' And we think that even her Unitarian friends, with whom she was chiefly conversant here, and who may therefore have sat for the picture she has drawn of female pursuits among us, will not thank her for the justness of that picture. Nor do we think that the effeminate and sickly and sickening process of training females which she stigmatizes as prevalent here, is even the *artful* process for teaching them "to catch men" — such men as are worth catching. They prefer to be caught by something more substantial; nor do they distrust their ability "to govern" something more substantial, if need be.

But we do object, most seriously, to a process for turning women into men, and, of consequence, men into women;—and then turning all to herd together like the brutes by the perfect freedom of divorce, the annihilation of delicacy, and the prostration of moral and religious restraints!

We have just spoken of our age, in this connection, as an *astonishing age*. And we spoke it designedly. It does astonish us, every five years, with some prodigious problem in human action. But in the midst of our profoundest astonishment at what even some *women* can become, we wish distinctly to say, that we are neither dismayed nor discouraged. Nay, we do not for one moment waver in our strong belief, that, after all, the present is one of the most glorious ages the world has ever seen—the most prolific of good, and the most highly fraught with rational and joyous hope for the best interests of humanity. And even the wild and paradoxical outbreakings, both in principle and action, do but in fact *confirm* this joyous hope. It is thus that the history of man and of Providence, bids us interpret these portentous enigmas. For when, since man has been upon the earth, has there ever been any material advance in human thought, or any efficient movement for human welfare, either for time or eternity, that has not been marked and verified by just such outbreakings? At the coming of Christ, the devils were let loose in all their fury; and their legions seemed clustered from the four winds, and all swarming in Judea, that focus, for the time, of good as well as bad action and doctrine. And they were all compelled, too, in due time, to bear testimony to Christ! It is at once an illustration and a type of the universal fact. And then, when the apostles spread abroad the life-giving Gospel, everywhere there came forth heresies in doc-

trine and schisms in action, more monstrous than any we now witness. And again, at the great era of light when the protestant reformation dawned, no arithmetic can compute the forms of simultaneous error and fanaticism, that started into being. And women, too, then, as likewise in the days of the apostles, and now, were found "asserting their rights" in the most absurd and fantastical ways. And, *puris naturalibus*, some of them paraded the streets of Münster, in company with men, crying *we are the naked truth*. No strange thing, then, is happening to us now. Such people caused Luther, and Paul before him, more trouble than they can possibly cause us, in this age of greater civilization. We therefore see no occasion for dismay; nor for decrying our period as a retrograde age; nor yet for lifting the standard of *ultra-conservatism*, as some in their panic seem hastening to do. The pillars of heaven are not tottering. Nor can the female preachers, whether of righteousness or of licentiousness, shake them. We need not recall all our energies into the attitude of defence, and abandon our aggressive enterprises against the kingdom of evil. Neither the apostles nor the protestant reformers were thus frightened into their citadel. The church need not stop the victorious march of her volunteer bands, either through need of their strength for the defence of her walls, or through a feverish panic, lest, in such a period, they should wheel, with hostile banners, on the holy city itself! If the church is now thus frightened, it only proves her present members unworthy of the glorious age in which God has cast their lot. But the many cannot be thus frightened. They are not such raw recruits, without nerve to stand, or without science to interpret the history of the past or to discern the signs of the present times. The ship is not foundering, and we need not throw overboard our most weighty and precious things. The gale, though stiff, is but wafting her more swiftly to her haven.—Conservatism, such as Paul's and Luther's, we must indeed have. But *ultra-conservatism* we must not invoke, at such a time;—unless, in fact, we would be babies—such as deserve, and such as will assuredly soon feel the leading strings of their sisters! The christian women of the nineteenth century, enlightened, modest, amiable, obedient even, as they are and will be, will not, cannot, ought not, to look supinely on such pusillanimity as this in the leaders of the Lord's host. Let the church retrograde into such a position, and we shall soon see a far different sort of women from any

that we or the christian world has yet seen, crowding the stage of public action ;—not, we would trust, to clamor about female rights, but to show by their efficient deeds, in *some way*, that they cannot see a world sink in ruin, without attempting something. And who will blame them for this, should the time come when the very “stones shall cry out !” If good men would not see such times, and make them too, they will do well to ponder the *whole* import of the phrase “christian prudence,” till they see that it is often much more imprudent to do *nothing*, than to press on in a course of good action, although that course must be exposed, in such a world as this, to some incidental evils, and perhaps great evils. Suddenly to stop, or even materially to change the characteristic movements of an age, would be often as perilous as it is impossible.

We have dwelt so long on these rather important matters to the present moment, that we have now but scanty time in which to notice, as they deserve, the other kindred principles contained in the books before us.

The uniform tendency of her writings, so far as we have read them, is directly towards the rankest infidelity. She even sneers at some portions of the Bible, such as the representation of heaven under the name of a city. Yet she just as uniformly professes to advocate what she would represent as the very essence and life of a truly enlightened Christianity. She takes Dr. Priestley as her oracle among the departed ; and Dr. Follen she regards as the greatest man among the living. Dr. Channing she praises much and censures somewhat, and would except him and a few others from the tremendous inculpations which she deals forth on certain undesignated unitarian preachers in the region of Boston, for pretending to support in their pulpits what she thinks they do not believe. She lectures them smartly, both for their hypocrisy and their cowardice in not carrying their people forward to new and more perfect developments of the unitarian system, and a more complete emancipation from the remnants of orthodox reverence and orthodox modes of thought and action in respect to the Bible and the ordinances of religion.

“I was told a great deal about *the first people of Boston*,” she says ; “which is perhaps as aristocratic, vain, and vulgar a city—as any in the world. The aristocracy of mere wealth,—is the only kind of vulgarity I saw in the United States. Boston is the head quarters of cant. Notwithstanding its superior

intelligence — there is an extraordinary and most pernicious union, in more than a few scattered instances, of profligacy and the worst kind of infidelity, with a strict religious profession, and an outward demeanor of remarkable propriety. As regards the cant, I believe that it proceeds chiefly from the spirit of caste which flourishes in a society which, on Sundays and holidays, professes to have ~~inured~~ ^{inured} it." We know not how her good unitarian friends will relish these charges of infidelity, *hypocrisy*, and CANT, from their zealous sister—who, after all, does not so much blame the infidelity as the cowardice in shrinking from an open profession of it.

Her views and feelings in regard to missions and other labors of christian beneficence, may be judged of from the following remarks, in her account of the fine time she had among the officers and soldiers of fort Mackinaw, on the lakes, where she learnt something about the Indians and the mission among them. "There is reason to think that the mission is the least satisfactory part of the establishment on the island.—I fear that the common process has here been gone through, of attempting to take from the savage the venerable and the true, and to force upon him something else which is to him neither venerable nor true." This, it seems, is not simply the fault of our mission there, it is "the common process" in protestant missions thus to take away religious truth and real worship from the savages. She elsewhere shows herself a great admirer of savage life, as the French infidels were before her. But if Christianity in any form is to be forced upon them, she thinks the popish the best. For she adds: "The English and the Americans, have never succeeded with the aborigines so well as the French [catholics;] and it may be doubted whether the clergy have been a much greater blessing to them than the traders!"—Nor is it merely the *savages* that are injured by protestant evangelization. In her other book, she intimates clearly enough her admiration of the Chinese worship compared with our bigotry; but we have neither time nor heart to present the case.

By the way, as we have just written the word *bigotry*, and as she and her "unitarian friends" are pretty liberal in their use of the term, we are reminded of what we intended to show at some length, but have not room to do it, viz. that we know of no books in any language more perfectly embued with this quality than the two at the head of this article. Johnson defines *bigotry*, "blind zeal, prejudice; the practice of a bigot."

And a *bigot*, he simply tells us, "is a man devoted to a certain party." More zealous and absolute devotedness to *party* and to *party measures*, and those of the rankest kind, we have never seen. In religion, it is, (where it has indeed been found before,) for the lowest Unitarianism;—in politics, for what in France was called jacobinism;—on abolition it is, for "the most straitest sect," and the most unflinching party measures. Wo betide the man or the woman, who swerves or wavers in any one of these matters. He can possess neither talents nor goodness. If this is not bigotry, neither we nor the lexicographers can tell what the thing is—unless, perchance, it be a term of reproach to be applied exclusively to evangelical and sober people!

Dr. Beecher, as we have before intimated, she seems to regard as about the worst of bigots. He opposes the catholics, and does not promote the right measures for emancipation, and he is also orthodox. Nor is she content with repeatedly putting the brand on his forehead. With a vengeance, (though without expressly naming them in the passage), she visits his transgressions on his daughters—whose talents and energy we should at least have supposed would shield them from the *contempt*, if not the *hatred*, of such a lover of female energy and enterprise.

"Revivals of religion," she of course abhors. But we shall not stop to quote her here.

Nor is she any more fond of the christian Sabbath as a day of worship. We must hear her a moment on this vital matter, though she has a pretty doleful story to tell, before she gets through, concerning both the desire and "the cowardice" of our Miss Sedgwick, in regard to destroying that prime bulwark of vital religion and morality.

"The asceticism of America is much like that of every other place. It brings religion down to be ceremonial, constrained, anxious, and altogether divested of its free, generous, and joyous character. It fosters timid selfishness in some; and in others a precise proportion of reckless licentiousness. Its manifestations in Boston are as remarkable as in the strictest of Scotch towns. Youths in Boston, who work hard all the week, desire fresh air and exercise, and a sight of the country, on Sundays. The country must be reached over the long bridges before-mentioned, and the youths must ride to obtain their object. They have been brought up to think it a sin to take a ride on Sundays. Once having yielded, and being under a sense of transgression for a wholly fictitious offence, they rarely stop

there. They next join parties to smoke, and perhaps to drink, and so on. If they had but been brought up to know that the Sabbath, like all times and seasons, was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; that their religion is in their state of mind, and not in the arrangement of their day, their Sabbaths would most probably have been spent as innocently as any other day."—Vol. ii. p. 341.

This is in perfect accordance with all her teaching elsewhere, and with her practice, so far as she has seen fit, (rather ostentatiously sometimes), to publish it. For instance, she somewhere tells us how, on a Sabbath when in a steamboat on the Mississippi, she scorned to listen to a sermon which a minister on board was preaching, and preferred to be about something else.—But we must return to the same page again, and hear her lecture to her admired and bosom friend, Miss Sedgwick, of the good puritanic town of Stockbridge, Mass.

"The author of 'Home' arranged the Sunday in her book, somewhat differently from the usual custom; describing the family whose home she pictured as spending the Sunday afternoon on the water, after a laborious week, and an attendance on public worship in the morning. Religious conversation was described as going on throughout the day. So much offence was taken at the idea of a Sunday sail, that the editor of the book requested the author to alter the chapter; the first print being proposed to be cancelled. I am sorry to say that she did alter it. If she was converted to the popular superstition, (which could scarcely be conceived), no more is to be said. If not, it was a matter of principle which she ought not to have yielded. If books are to be altered, an author's convictions to be unrepresented, to avoid shocking religious prejudices, there is a surrender, not only of the author's noblest prerogative, but of his highest duty."—p. 341. Note.

How Miss Sedgwick will relish this severe castigation and this more tremendous breach of confidence in revealing a bad secret which it had cost so much trouble and money to suppress, and all this, by a bosom friend whom she had so long welcomed in her village and at her home, we are not able to decide. We hope the loss of character, in the eye of her own New England, will not make her quite as reckless in her own future conduct or writings, as the Boston Sabbath-breakers become by their exposure on the bridges. If so, we must tremble at the appearance of her next book. But how could Miss M. be so inconsistent with the principle she had just noticed so strongly—and how could she be so ungrateful and cruel toward her admired

and confidential friend, as thus to expose and thus to tempt her!—Or are we to understand all this, and all her revelations respecting her Boston friends, as only a sound and integral part of that improved code of human intercourse between Sabbath-breakers, which is to take the place of God's law?

However plausible may be the arguments, in some cases, for the violation of the Sabbath, and however insidious the attacks of those who hate its restraints, we confess we can regard the unblushing authors of such attacks, in no other light than that of the most dangerous enemies to human society on earth, and human felicity hereafter. Send young people off on a Sabbath excursion of pleasure, by land or water, and it matters little that you set them to conversing on religion. It will at best be but a blind-fold to their consciences—if it be not in fact such conversation as we find in the book before us, and fitted only to poison the very life of all conscience.—And then for *women* openly to preach the desecration of the Sabbath; *women*, who owe to the benign and humanizing influence of the Puritan Sabbath, all the elevation they enjoy in England and this country above their degraded sisters of continental Europe and the rest of the world; for *women*, thus fostered and blessed by such a Sabbath, to lead the very van for its destruction, is but another instance where fact surpasses fiction and belies the common principles of our rational nature.

But there are other most serious changes in morals and religion, with which this reforming law-giver proposes to usher in the new reign of perfect freedom. The few we can stand to notice, respect chiefly the clergy, and their modes of influence. She laughs at their 'scruples about playing cards, and at that "Boston prudery" which prevents their attending the theatre.' "The clergy should dance, like others, as they have the same kind of bodies to be animated, and of minds to be exhilarated." She would have them change their whole demeanor, and mingle in all the gaities of fashionable life. Their present influence, she thinks most baneful. She would also have them mingle in all the political strifes of the day. 'Nay, they must engage eagerly in worldly pursuits. And that for the very purpose of making them like other worldly men, and no longer bigoted fools.' "The ascetic practice of taking care of one another's morals," and of minister's taking care of them as they do, alarms her exceedingly, and she is glad to find at least one minister to join her in devising a remedy.

"A most liberal-minded clergyman, a man as democratic in his religion, and as genial in his charity, as any layman in the land, remarked to me one day on the existence of this strong religious sensibility in the children of the Pilgrims, and asked me what I thought should be done to cherish and enlarge it, we having been alarming each other with the fear that it would be exasperated by the prevalent superstition, and become transmuted, in the next generation, to something very unlike religious sensibility. We proposed great changes in domestic and social habits: less formal religious observance in families, and more genial interest in the intellectual provinces of religion: more rational promotion of health, by living according to the laws of nature, which ordain bodily exercise and mental refreshment. We proposed that new temptations to walking, driving, boating, etc. should be prepared, and the delights of natural scenery laid open much more freely than they are; that social amusements of every kind should be encouraged, and all religious restraints upon speech and action removed: in short, that spontaneousness should be revered and approved above all things, whatever form it may take."—p. 345.

"Symptoms of the breaking out of the true genial spirit of liberty were continually delighting me. A Unitarian clergyman, complaining of the superstition of the body to which he belonged, while they were perpetually referring to their comparative freedom, observed, "We are so bent on standing fast in our liberty, that we don't get on." Another remarked upon an eulogy bestowed on some one as a man and a Christian: "as if," said the speaker, "the Christian were the climax! as if it were not much more to be a man than a Christian!"—p. 346.

What a revealer of the secrets of *some* of the clergy! Let us now see what she says of the clergy as a mass.

"The American clergy are the most backward and timid class in the society in which they live; self-exiled from the great moral questions of the time; the least informed with true knowledge; the least efficient in virtuous action; the least conscious of that christian and republican freedom which, as the native atmosphere of piety and holiness, it is their prime duty to cherish and diffuse."—p. 353.

"Seeing what I have seen, I can come to no other conclusion than that the most guilty class of the community in regard to the slavery question at present is, not the slave-holding, nor even the mercantile, but the clerical: the most guilty, because not only are they not blinded by life-long custom and prejudice, nor by pecuniary interest, but they profess to spend their lives in the study of moral relations, and have pledged themselves to declare the whole counsel of God."—p. 356.

About all the good Miss Martineau thinks the clergy can do, is to preach such things as abolitionism and women's rights; and these, alas, they will not do. In the notice we have occasionally taken of this woman's abolition principles, it will not be understood that we design at all to meddle with this question as a party matter among ourselves. She as a foreigner seems to suppose, (absurdly enough,) that all who oppose a certain set of measures for abolition, are either hostile or cold towards the cause of emancipation.

Though she considers "the American clergy the least informed with true knowledge," still, so far as *religious* science is concerned, the acting pastors are spoiled by knowing too much. They should know nothing of it. "The scientific study and popular administration of religion," she mournfully says, "have not only been confided to the same persons, but actually mixed up and confounded in the heads and hands of those persons." She would have a few recluses study the doctrines of religion, though it would unfit them for the pastoral work. But the pastors, the preachers of religion, (or rather of politics,) should study the politics and the exciting topics of the day,—should know how to play at cards, and to dance, and to grace the drawing rooms;—but should not dream of entering the chamber of sickness, or the house of mourning, except it be the hovel of extreme poverty! She ridicules a minister for attempting to console a bereaved mother; but we must omit the passage and give only the following short one.

"Over those who consider the clergy 'faithful guardians,' their influence, as far as it is professional, is bad: as far as it is that of friendship or acquaintanceship, it is according to the characters of the men. I am disposed to think ill of the effects of the practice of parochial visiting, except in cases of poor and afflicted persons, who have little other resource of human sympathy. I cannot enlarge upon the disagreeable subject of the devotion of the ladies to the clergy. I believe there is no liberal-minded minister who does not see, and too sensibly feel, the evil of women being driven back upon religion as a resource against vacuity; and of there being a professional class to administer it. Some of the most sensible and religious elderly women I know in America speak, with a strength which evinces strong conviction, of the mischief to their sex of ministers entering the profession young and poor, and with a great enthusiasm for parochial visiting. There is no very wide difference between the auricular confession of the catholic church, and the spiritual confidence reposed in ministers the most devoted to visiting

their flocks. Enough may be seen in the religious periodicals of America about the help women give to young ministers by the needle, by raising subscriptions, and by more toilsome labors than they should be allowed to undergo in such a cause."—p. 363.

The influence of the isolated clergy, she tells us, is "confined to the weak members of society, women and superstitious men." And not only does she despise the *weak* women for their friendliness to ministers, but she ridicules them for reading the Bible as they do. "I saw women—laboring at their New Testament, reading superstitiously a daily portion of that which was already too familiar to the ear to leave any genuine and lasting impression, thus read."

Nor is it merely, nor perhaps chiefly, the orthodox clergy that she has in view, as the Unitarians were the men of whom she knew most.

"The fearful and disgraceful mistake about the true nature of the clerical office,—the supposition that it consists in adapting the truth to the minds of the hearers,—is already producing its effect in thinning the churches, and impelling the people to find an administration of religion better suited to their need. The want of faith in other men and in principles, and the superabundant faith in themselves, shown in this notion of pastoral duty, (which has been actually preached, as well as pleaded in private,) are so conspicuous, as to need no further exposure. The history of priesthoods may be referred to as an exhibition of its consequences. I was struck at first with an advocacy of ordinances among some of the Unitarian clergy, which I was confident must go beyond their own belief. I was told that a great point was made of them, (not as observances but as ordinances,) because the public mind required them. I saw a minister using vehement and unaccustomed action, (of course wholly inappropriate,) in a pulpit not his own; and was told that that set of people required plenty of action to be assured the preacher was in earnest."—p. 357.

What will her Unitarian brethren say of these revelations of their hypocrisy? Again,

"My final impression is, that religion is best administered in America by the personal character of the most virtuous members of society, out of the theological profession: and next, by the acts and preachings of the members of that profession who are the most secular in their habits of mind and life. The exclusively clerical are the worst enemies of Christianity, except the vicious."—p. 364.

Nor are we yet at the bottom. 'Beneath this lowest depth, there is still a lower deep.' All cannot be accomplished in a

day ; and therefore she is at the trouble of telling how the clergy should be reformed and rendered more harmless, so long as clergy and churches are still to be borne as an incubus on society.

But when the regimen of women shall have fully come, (perhaps old John Knox himself would not now dare to call it "the abominable regiment of women,") when that illustrious era of liberty and equality, shall arrive, if not before, all churches are to be disbanded ! And the gospel ministry is to be annihilated ! "The worst enemies of Christianity" and of man, will cease from the face of the whole earth. For, she continues,

"The fault is not in the Voluntary System ; for the case is equally bad on both sides the Atlantic : and an Establishment like the English does little more than superadd the danger of a careless, ambitious, worldly clergy, in the richer priests of the church, and an overworked and ill-recompensed set of working clergy. The evil lies in a superstition which no establishment can ever obviate ; in the superstition, to use the words of an American clergyman, "of believing that religion is something else than goodness." From this it arises that an ecclesiastical profession still exists ; not for the study of theological science, (which is quite reasonable,) but for the dispensing of goodness. From this it arises that ecclesiastical goodness is practically separated from active personal and social goodness. From this it arises that the yeomanry of America, those who are ever in the presence of God's high priest, Nature, and out of the worldly competitions of a society sophisticated with superstition, are perpetually in advance of the rest of the community on the great moral questions of the time, while the clergy are in the rear.

"What must be done ? The machinery of administration must be changed. The people have been brought up to suppose that they saw Christianity in their ministers. The first consequence of this mistake was, that Christianity was extensively misunderstood ; as it still is. The trying moral conflicts of the time are acting as a test. The people are rapidly discovering that the supposed faithful mirror is a grossly refracting medium ; and the blessed consequence will be, that they will look at the object for themselves, declining any medium at all. The clerical profession is too hard and too perilous a one, too little justifiable on the ground of principle, too much opposed to the spirit of the gospel, to outlive long the individual research into religion, to which the faults of the clergy are daily impelling the people.

"To what then must we meantime trust for religion ?—To the administration of God, and the heart of man. Has not God his own

ways, unlike our ways, of teaching when man misteaches? It is worth travelling in the wild west, away from churches and priests, to see how religion springs up in the pleasant woods, and is nourished by the winds and the star-light. The child on the grass is not alone in listening for God's tramp on the floor of his creation. We are all children, ever so listening."—pp. 364, 366.

"The dignity of theological study arises from its being subservient to the administration of religion. The last was Christ's own office; the highest which can be discharged by man: so high as to indicate that when its dignity is fully understood, it will be confided to the hands of no class of men. Theologians there will probably always be; but no man will be a priest in those days to come when every man will be a worshipper."—p. 331.

Thus it is that she closes her first and chief work on America! The other work is a hasty after piece, designed to give Europeans some clearer views of the routes she took and the things she saw here; and is a much feebler performance. Her descriptions of scenery are poor, being confused and indistinct.

Should any blame us for a want of delicacy in treating the performance of a *woman* in the way we have done, we would ask them just to run their eye over our pages again, and see if we have used any hard epithets, or have been guilty of any other indelicacy than that of suffering her to speak for herself through these pages. On this last point, we confess we have felt some misgivings; nor could we have suffered her thus to speak, had we not hoped, as we still do hope, that it may prove a timely warning to such, (if there be any,) as may need warning in respect to following in the train of measures which she commends for the attainment of equal rights and human felicity on earth. We wish them to look, as she does, at the system as one grand and connected whole, and then to judge of all its parts, and of its authors.

In closing, we must be allowed to remind our readers of what we intimated at the beginning, that we have not undertaken to review Miss Martineau's works as a whole. Our chief object has been, to present the *moral and religious* aspect of the works before us. It has been a painful task. But in the discharge of this delicate and rather perilous duty, it has been our constant aim, to render ample honor to the better half of creation; and not only so, but to do what lies in our power to rescue them from the opprobrium that must practically accrue to their general character from such examples as the one which has now

been glaring before the world. To show that this is not a fair sample—to guard against its baleful effects—and to give timely warning against its imitation, we hope will not prove a useless labor, however inglorious. Much more congenial would it have been to our feelings, to call the attention of our readers to some among the many bright pages in these books—pages deeply fraught with interest, and often highly flattering to American feeling. But the moral bearing of the whole, has ruined the whole. A mind of uncommon power, hot with the fanaticism of infidel and visionary politics, and blindly hastening to precipitate society into the gulf of licentiousness, is among the saddest spectacles since the fall of mother Eve.

ARTICLE VII.

WHAT WERE THE VIEWS ENTERTAINED BY THE EARLY REFORMERS ON THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION, FAITH, AND THE ACTIVE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST?

By Rev. E. W. Landis, Jeffersonville, Pa. [Concluded from page 197.]

§ III. *Views of the Reformers on the Obedience of Christ.*

ON this topic our position is that even if those who have been complained of as unsound in the faith* had denied the im-

* The following extracts will afford the reader a brief view of the controversy which now exists in relation to this subject, and of the importance which is attached to it by many. Dr. Junkin's ninth charge against Mr. Barnes is in these words: "Mr. Barnes denies that the righteousness, i. e. the active obedience of Christ to the law, is imputed to his people for their justification; so that they are righteous in the eye of the law, and therefore justified." This charge he endeavors to establish by various quotations from Mr. Barnes's book; upon which, among other remarks, he speaks as follows:—"The silence of this book of Notes on the subject of Christ's righteousness, (i. e. his active obedience,) being imputed to his people for their justification, gives ground to a strong presumption that the doctrine is rejected by its author. To this I know it will be objected, that it is hard to condemn a man for what he does not say. Mr. Barnes was

putation of Christ's active obedience, they might still hold the very same views of the doctrine of Justification, which were

bound, in expounding this Epistle, to make the doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ, and *particularly his active obedience, the prominent feature of his work*. In a thousand texts it is clearly stated that righteousness is the title to life: *righteousness the actual and active obedience to law, and salvation, are united as antecedent and consequent.*" —"Turn back to the quotation from p. 127. 'There is the whole comment on the phrase 'By the obedience of one.' On which a real Calvinistic Presbyterian would have given his heart full flow, and let his pen run rampant. But there you have it, text and comment, in five brief lines. Now I ask, Why this brevity? Why is *that* by which many are made righteous, dismissed so cavalierly? Why is this, which he admits stands opposed to the disobedience of Adam, hurried out of sight? If it stands opposed, is it not the opposite of Adam's disobedience? And what is the opposite of disobedience? is it not obedience? and what is disobedience but want of conformity with law? Must not then the obedience which is the opposite of this be conformity with law?—*active compliance!* Oh! how could my brother shut his eyes against this most glorious point of gospel truth?—a point on which all the bright rays of the Sun of righteousness converge to a focus, that might make the eyes of an archangel blench; and shrivel like a parched scroll, the entire legions of lost spirits who can never say through grace, 'The Lord is my righteousness.' But so it is. Admitting the truth that the obedience of the one is Christ's, and that it includes his entire work, he tries to turn it off, by quoting Phil. 2: 3, 'He—became *obedient* unto death'—italicising *obedient* to make the reader think that all Christ's work consisted in suffering. Ah! this Parthian arrow is not medicated with Presbyterian oil." See *Vindication*, pp. 122—130.

To this charge Mr. Barnes replies as follows: "My general plea is, that the charge is not sustained by the passages which are quoted from my book. The charge is that I have *denied* that 'the active obedience of Christ is imputed to his people for their justification; and is followed by an *inference* of Dr. Junkin from this, that I also deny that they 'are righteous in the sight of the law.' In regard to this I observe, 1. That the charge is *not* that I denied that the benefits of the work of Christ are imputed to men, or that they were justified on account of what he had done. So explicit were my repeated declarations on this subject, that it was not possible to allege that I denied this. 2. I have *not* denied that the active obedience of Christ is imputed to his people. 3. I have *not* denied that his people are 'righteous in the sight of the law, and therefore justified.' This is another of the injurious and unfounded inferences which Dr. Junkin has felt himself at liberty to charge me with holding. In the very

entertained by all the first Reformers without one solitary exception. They all, with unanimous consent, affirmed the plain, simple, scriptural doctrine to be, that we are justified by the *death* of Christ, when on account of it (*cum propter eam* is the ever-recurring expression) we have obtained the forgiveness of sins. If then the charge were substantiated, that certain brethren do really reject the imputation of Christ's active obedience for justification, it would still furnish not one particle of proof that they have abandoned the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*.

The question in relation to this topic, was actually unknown to the church *until after the death of Calvin*. It was, by some obscure individuals, started about A. D. 1564; and drew after it the query, whether justification consisted in pardon only; together with a host of similar questions. For a long time after it was started it received but little attention. Dr. Pareus declared it to be a question which called forth "more of dangerous speculation, than of solid truth, and more of learning than of faith."* About the year 1570, it was introduced at Wittenberg, but it seems to have died away because no one appeared to regard it as a subject worthy of serious consideration. Prior to this time, however, no eminent writer among the reformers notices the distinction. They content themselves with saying, as above remarked, that we are justified by the death of Christ, when on account of it we have forgiveness of sin.†

passages which he has quoted, I have affirmed the contrary." See *Defence*, pp. 255—257.

In the *Minutes* of the General Assembly of 1837, in relation to the same charge, those who were considered as entertaining views similar to those of Mr. Barnes, made the following disclaimer: "All believers are justified, not on the ground of personal merit, but solely on the ground of the obedience and death, or, in other words, the righteousness of Christ. And while that righteousness does not become theirs, in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities and merit; yet, from respect to it, God can, and does treat them as if they were righteous." See *Protest*, pp. 481—486.

* "Plus periculosae subtilitatis, quam solidae veritatis: plusque ingenii quam fidei."

† Protestants should be careful on this subject lest when they object against the pope's making new articles of faith (*statuere articulos fidei*) the argument be retorted. For in the instance before us, and in the others above noticed, we have seen, in the lapse of two centu-

Subsequently, however, when the French Synod manifested a good deal of zeal on the subject ; and after it had by a vote decided what was orthodox in relation to it ; the distinction was more generally considered by theologians, in their writings, as we shall remark hereafter. This Synod distinguished itself, by the great anxiety it evinced to have the distinction regarded. It wrote to all the eminent schools and academies ; and even to many learned individuals, pressing the subject upon their attention. But the writings of Gomar have done more to enstamp it with the features of Calvinism, than those of all his contemporaries. He was likewise perpetually inculcating the distinction upon the minds of his pupils ; and as one of his friends very sagely remarks, “ correcting the opposite errors found scattered about even in the writings of great men,” (in *magnorum etiam virorum scriptis sparsos* ;) that is, he became the Index Expurgatorius of the Reformation. For the pains which he took on this subject, however, he was by the primitive school of Calvinists styled by the ungracious appellation of an *innovator*. Whether this charge was without foundation, the reader will determine for himself presently.

As the principle embraced in the topic now before us, is so interwoven with the two preceding, that it is extremely difficult to separate them, the reader will excuse us, if the quotations which we now make should sometimes express views similar to those presented in the preceding sections of this article.

For reasons before expressed we deem it unnecessary to go into a detailed examination of the views of the *original* reformers. We shall confine our attention principally to those who lived and wrote after the distinction referred to began to be made.

The language of the first reformers on this subject was in entire unison with that of the primitive church ; of *Austin*, for instance, who says, “ Our sanctuary is the pardon of sins, which is to be justified by his blood. When the Father is displeased with us, he considers the death of his Son and is reconciled. *My entire hope is in the death of my Lord. His DEATH is my MERIT, my REFUGE, my SALVATION, my LIFE, and my RESURRECTION.*” This is the uniform language of the first reformers

ries, that non-essential points of doctrine have expanded into articles of faith in every sense of the word.

* For the original, see Vol. XI. p. 454.

without exception. In proof of this it will be necessary only to quote the language of Calvin, and a few confessions. Our other references shall be to divines of a later date.

I. We begin with *Calvin*. After quoting with approbation the following passages from Hilary, “the *cross*, the *death*, and the descent of Christ into hades, *are our life* ;” and “The Son of God is in hades, but man is brought back again to Heaven,”* he goes on again to speak as follows : “Therefore, although *we possess in the death of Christ the entire accomplishment of our salvation, because by it we are reconciled to God*, the law satisfied, the curse taken away, and the punishment endured ; yet we affirm that it is not by his death, but by his resurrection that we are born again unto a lively hope, (1 Pet. 1: 3.) as he appeared the conqueror of death by rising again ; so the victory of our faith is stayed upon his resurrection : or, as it is better expressed in the words of Paul, when he says, He died for our sins, he was raised again for our justification, Rom. 4: 25. As if he had said, sin was taken away by his death, righteousness was renewed and restored *by his resurrection*. For how could he have liberated us from death, by dying, if he himself had yielded to death ? How could he have purchased victory for us, if he had fallen in the conflict ? Wherefore we thus procure the material of our own salvation between the death and the resurrection of Christ : because, by the former his sin was abolished and death destroyed ; and by the latter, righteousness was repaired and life restored. So that, however, by the benefit of the latter, the former brings to us its force and efficiency. Therefore we remember, that as often as there is mention made of his death alone, there is at the same time included therein, that which pertains to the resurrection. The same may be affirmed when his resurrection alone is spoken of ; that it likewise includes what is peculiar to his death.”† Here then is the sentiment of Calvin. When the death of Christ is spoken of, his resurrection is included. And it is to *these alone*, and not to his active obedience before death, that he attributes our complete salvation. But let us hear him again.

* “Crux, mors, inferi, nostra vita sunt.—Filius Dei in infernis est : sed homo refertur ad coelum.”—*Calvini Instit.* Lib. II. cap. 16.

† “Proinde tametsi in ejus morte habemus solidum salutis complementum, quia per eam et Deo reconciliati sumus, et justo ejus judicio satisfactum, et maledictio sublata, et perempta est poena : dicimus

In the following passage the reader will perceive how entirely Calvin avoids making any mention of Christ's active obedience, though he is summing up in the minutest manner every part of his merit from which salvation and happiness are derived to us. His words are: "But when we behold that the entire sum of our salvation, and all its parts, are comprehended in Christ, let us be warned not to seek the least particle of it from another. If life be sought, we, in the name of Jesus teach, that it is at his disposal. If any other gifts of the Spirit are sought, whatever they might be they are found in his unction. If patience, it is found in the assurance that he reigns. If purity, in his conception. If indulgence, think of his nativity, by which he was made like to us in all things, that he might be able to suffer. If redemption is sought, seek it in his suffering; if absolution, in his condemnation; if remission of the curse, in his cross; if satisfaction, in his sacrifice; if purgation, in his blood; if reconciliation, in his descent into hades; if mortification of the flesh, in his burial. If newness of life, in his resurrection; *if immortality, in the same*; if an inheritance in the heavenly kingdom, in his entrance into heaven; if protection, defence, if abundance of all good, look for it in his kingdom. If you desire security, in the expectation of judgment, look to the power of judging which has been committed to him. To conclude, in this treasury there is contained every thing that can constitute happiness; from thence you may draw, and be satisfied, but not from any

tamen non per mortem, sed per resurrectionem regenerati in spem vivam (1 Pet. 1: 3): quia ut ille resurgendo victor mortis emersit, ita fidei nostrae victoria in ipsa deum consistit resurrectione. Quale hoc sit, melius Pauli verbis exprimitur: mortuum enim dicit propter peccata nostra, suscitatum propter nostram justificationem (Rom. 4: 25): acsi diceret, morte ejus sublatum peccatum, resurrectione instauratam restitutamque justitiam. Quomodo enim moriendo liberare nos a morte poterat, si morti ipse succubisset? quomodo comparasset nobis victoriam, si in certamine defecisset? Quare sic salutis nostrae materiam inter Christi mortem et resurrectionem partimur, quod per illam peccatum abolitum, et mors extincta: per hanc, justitia reparata, et erecta vita: sic tamen ut hujus beneficio vim efficaciamque suam illa nobis proferat. Proinde meminerimus, quoties solius mortis sit mentio, simul comprehendendi quod proprium est resurrectionis: parem quoque synecdochen esse in voce *resurrectionis*, quoties seorsum a morte ponitur: ut secum trahat, quod peculiariter morti convenit."—*Ut supra*, Cap. II. sect. 13.

other.”* Not one word here about any thing flowing to us from his active obedience.

Once more. “But that Christ by his obedience, truly merited and acquired favor with the Father for us, can be clearly and fully collected from many places in the Scriptures. For this I take for granted, that if Christ made satisfaction for our sins, if he paid thoroughly the penalty due to us; if his obedience pleased God, and to conclude, if the just suffered for the unjust; then his righteousness obtained salvation for us, just in proportion as it availed and deserved. Truly as is testified by Paul, we are reconciled, and obtain reconciliation by his death (Rom. 5: 11). But reconciliation cannot exist, unless where the offence precedes. The sense therefore is that God, to whom we are hateful on account of sin, has become appeased by the *death* of his Son, so that he is now pacified towards us. And it should be particularly noticed what the antithesis is which follows in Rom. 2: 19: ‘As by the transgression of one, many were constituted sinners: so even by obedience many were constituted righteous.’ For the sense is, as we are alienated from God, and destined to destruction by the sin of Adam, so by the obedience of Christ, we were received into favor as righteous.—In all other respects, when we affirm that grace was obtained for us by the merit of Christ, we thereby understand that we are cleansed by his blood, and that his death is an expiation for our sins. ‘His blood cleanses us from sin.’ His blood was pour-

* “Quando autem totam salutis nostrae summam ac singulas etiam partes videmus in Christo comprehensas, cavendum ne vel minimam partiunculam alio derivemus. Si salus quaeritur, ipso nomine Jesu docemur, penes eum esse: si Spiritus alia quaelibet dona, in ejus unctione reperientur: si fortitudo, in ejus dominio: si puritas, in ejus conceptione: si indulgentia, in ejus nativitate se profert, qua factus est nobis per omnia similis, ut condolere disceret: si redemptio, in ejus passione: si absolutio, in ejus damnatione: si maledictionis remissio, in ejus cruce: si satisfactio, in ejus sacrificio: si purgatio, in ejus sanguine: si reconciliatio, in descensu ad inferos: si mortificatio carnis, in ejus sepulchro: si vitae novitas, in ejus resurrectione: si immortalitas, in eadem: si haereditas regni coelestis, in coeli ingressu: si praesidium, si securitas, si bonorum omnium copia et facultas, in ejus regno: si segura judicii expectatio, in potestate judicandi expectatio, in potestate judicandi illi tradita. Demque in ipso thesauro omne genus bonorum quum sint, inde ad satietatem hauriantur, non aliunde.”—*Ul Sup. Cnp. XVI. sect. 19.*

ed out for the remission of sins, (1 John 1: 7, Luke 22: 20). If this is the effect of his blood being poured out, that our sins are not imputed to us, *it follows that with that price the justice of God is satisfied.*—For it is superfluous, and therefore absurd, that Christ should have been burdened with the curse, unless that *by enduring what was due to others, he obtained righteousness for them.* Paul commends the grace of God in this, that he gave the price of *redemption in the death of Christ*: then he enjoins on us to *flee to his blood, that having obtained righteousness, we may stand secure at the judgment seat.* Therefore the same apostle defines redemption in the blood of Christ to be forgiveness of sins (Col. 1: 14), as if he would say that we are justified, or absolved before God because that blood has yielded satisfaction for us.”* A hundred similar passages could

* “Quod autem vere Christus sua obedientia nobis gratiam apud Patrem acquisierit ac promeritus sit, ex pluribus scripturae locis certo et solide colligitur. Nam hoc pro confesso suma, si pro peccatis nostris Christus satisfecit, si poenam nobis debitam persolvit, si obedientia sua Deum placavit, denique si justus pro injustis passus est: justitia ejus partam nobis salutem, quod tantundem valet ac promereri. Atqui teste Paulo reconciliati sumus, et reconciliationem accipimus per ejus mortem (Rom. 5: 11): Atqui reconciliatio locum non habet, nisi ubi offensio praecessit. Sensus ergo est, Deum, cui propter peccatum eramus exosi, morte Filii sui placatum fuisse, ut nobis sit propitius. Ac diligenter nolanda est, quae paulo post sequitur antithesis (Rom. 5: 12): ‘Sicuti per transgressionem unius peccatores constituti sunt multi: sic et per obedientiam justi constituuntur multi.’ Sensus enim est: Sicut Adae peccato alienati Deo sumus et destinati ad interitum, sita Christi obedientia, nos in favorem recepi tanquam justos. Nec futurum verbi tempus praesentem justitiam excludit: sicuti ex contextu apparet. Nam et prius dixerat, *χαρίσμα* ex multis delictis esse in justificationem. Caeterum quum dicimus, Christi meritum partam nobis esse gratiam, hoc intelligemus, sanguine ejus nos fuisse mundatos, et ejus mortem expiationem fuisse pro peccatis. ‘Sanguis ejus emundat nos a peccato. Hic sanguis est, qui effunditur in remissionem peccatorum’ (1 Jo. 1: 7. Luc. 22: 20). Si hic effectus est fusi sanguinis, ut non imputentur nobis peccata, sequitur eo pretio satisfactum esse judicio Dei.—Supervacuum enim, adeoque absurdum fuit, onerari Christum maledictione, nisi ut quod alii debebant persolvens, justitiam illis acquiveret.—Gratiam Dei in hoc commendat Paulus, quia redemptionis pretium debet in Christi morte: deinde jubet nos confugere ad ejus sanguinem, ut justitiam adepti coram Dei judicio securi stemus.—Ideo idem Apostolus, redemptionem in sanguine Christi definit admissionem peccatorum (Col.

be easily adduced, in which Calvin affirms that the obedience of Christ, by which we obtain righteousness and eternal life, is his passive obedience alone.

II. Our next reference shall be to the *Heidelberg Catechism*—the Calvinistic Catechism of the Reformed Churches. In answer to *Question 37*, “What dost thou understand by the words, ‘He suffered?’” It is said, “That he, all the time that he lived on earth, but especially at the end of his life, sustained in body and soul the wrath of God against the sins of all mankind; that so *by his suffering*, as the only propitiatory sacrifice, he might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation, and obtain for us the favor of God, righteousness and eternal life.”* In answer to *Question 66*, “What are the Sacraments?” It is remarked, “The sacraments are holy visible signs and seals, appointed of God for this end, that by the use thereof, he may the more fully declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel, viz. that he grants us freely the forgiveness of sin and life eternal for the sake of that one sacrifice of Christ accomplished on the cross.”† The next is, if possible, even more emphatic in the avowal of this doctrine. *Question 67*, “Are both word and sacraments then, ordained and appointed for this end, that they may direct our faith to the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, as the alone foundation of our salvation?” The answer is, “It is so. For the Holy Spirit teaches us in the Gospel, and assures us by the sacraments, that the whole of our salvation depends upon that one sacrifice of Christ which he offered for us on the cross.”‡ Here then

1: 14), acsi diceret, justificari nos vel absolvi coram Deo, quia sanguis ille in satisfactionem respondet.”—*Ut sup.* Cap. XVII. sect. 3, 4, 5.

* “Quid credis cum dicis: Passus est? *Resp.* Eum toto quidem vite sue tempore, quo in terris egit, praeipue vero in ejus extremo, iram Dei adversus peccatum universi generis humani, corpore et anima sustinuisse, ut sua passione tanquam unico sacrificio propitiatorio, corpus et animam nostram ab aeterna damnatione liberaret, et nobis gratiam Dei, justitiam et vitam aeternam acquireret.”

† “Quid sunt sacramenta? *Resp.* Sunt sacra et in oculos in currentia signa et sigilla, ob eam causam a Deo instituta, ut per ea nobis promissionem evangelii majis declaret et obsignet: quod scilicet non universis tantum, verum etiam singulis credentibus, propter unicum illud Christi sacrificium in cruce peractum, gratis donet remissionem peccatorum, et vitam aeternam.”

‡ “Num utraque igitur et verbum et sacramenta eo spectant, ut

it is most unequivocally declared that God bestows upon the elect, not only pardon, but eternal life, and this not in consequence of the active obedience of Christ, but “solely on account of that one sacrifice accomplished on the cross.” The same is likewise declared in *Question 76*, “What is it to eat the crucified body, and drink the shed blood of Christ? *Ans.* It is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and *thereby to obtain* pardon of sin, *and eternal life*; but besides this to become more and more united to his sacred body by the Holy Spirit,” etc.* The same doctrine is declared in several other questions and answers.

Here then, is the doctrine most unambiguously declared, and in the Palative Catechism too, the text book of all the early Calvinistic Churches after it was framed—that we are justified, and obtain eternal life by *Christ’s passive obedience alone*.—Not one syllable is uttered about the “imputation of his active obedience.”

The estimation in which this Catechism has ever been held by Calvinists, will show at once the extent and overwhelming force of its authority in a question like the one before us. Even the Synod of Dort, notwithstanding all the light that had been thrown upon the theology of the reformation by the refinements and innovations of the School of Gomar, yet declared that “the use of the Heidelberg Catechism should be earnestly continued in the churches of the Reformation; *inasmuch as it contained a truly accurate compendium of orthodox Christian doctrine, prepared with extraordinary wisdom.*”†

fidem nostram ad sacrificium Christi in cruce peractam, tanquam ad unicum nostrae salutis fundamentum, deducant? Resp. Ita est. Nam Spiritus Sanctus docet evangelio et confirmat sacramentis, omnem nostram salutem positam esse in unico sacrificio Christi pro nobis in cruce oblatis.—*Quaest. LXVII.*

* “*Quid est crucifixum corpus Christi edere, et fustum ejus sanguinem bibere? Resp. Est non tantum totam passionem et mortem Christi, certa animi fiducia amplecti, ac per id remissionem peccatorum et vitam aeternam adipisci: sed etiam per Spiritum Sanctum, qui simul in Christo et in nobis habitat, ita sacrosancto ejus corpori magis ac magis uniri,*” etc.

† “*Usus Catechismi Heidelbergensis in Ecclesiis reformatis mor-
dicus retinerentur:*” because that, “admodum accuratum orthodoxae doctrinae Christianae compendium singulari prudentia adornatum contineret.”—*Less. XV. (p. 36) and Less. CXLVIII. p. 318.*

III. We shall next hear the venerable *Ursinus*. His views of this subject have been brought out in the first section of this article, under the head of Justification, to which the reader is referred, Vol. XI. p. 459. We here add the following from the same author.

On p. 214, of his explanation of the Catechism he says, "Our entire salvation is found in the suffering and death of Christ."* On p. 215, "What did Christ suffer? By the word suffering is understood his whole humiliation, *or the obedience of his whole humiliation*, all his miseries, infirmities, griefs, torments, to which Christ was obnoxious in body and soul for our sake, from his birth until his death."†

On p. 340, (in a passage too long to be here quoted,) he proves at length that the holiness of Christ's human nature, (or his active compliance with law,) was a necessary requisite for him to become our Mediator. "In order that he might in our stead *perform obedience unto the death of the cross, and make satisfaction.*" Such passages as the following are of perpetual occurrence in his *Explanation*. "The washing of blood is the forgiveness of sins, *or justification for the sake of the shed blood of Christ.*" p. 375. "Justification which is by the blood of Christ." "The dominical supper testifies that the sacrifice of Christ alone justifies." Christ gives righteousness and eternal life to his people, on account of his blood poured out upon the cross."‡ For the shedding of blood completes the satisfaction, so that it alone is called our righteousness.

Ursinus, was the writer of the Heidelberg Catechism. If then, there could be any doubt whether this doctrine be taught in that symbol, that doubt can exist no longer. If any man

* "In ejus passione et morte tota nostra salus constitit."—*Ad Quaest. 37.*

† "Quid sit passus Christus? Nomine passionis intelligitur tota humilitatio, seu obedientia totius humiliationis, omnes miseriae, infirmitates, dolores, cruciatus, ignominiae, quibus *Christus* ab articulo natiuitatis ad horam usque mortis tam anima, quam corpore, nostra causa fuit obnoxius."—*Ad Quaest. XXXVII.*

‡ "Ablutio sanguinis est condonatio peccatorum, seu justificatio propter effusum sanguinem Christi.—Justificatio quae sit sanguine Christi.—Coena testatur, solum sacrificium Christi justificare.—Christus fidelibus suis donat justitiam et vitam aeternam propter sanguinem suum in cruce effusum.—Nam effusio sanguinis, est satisfactionis complementum: ideo sola dicitur justitia nostra."

could understand what were the views advanced in that Catechism, Ursinus was the man.

IV. *Piscator* is our next witness. He and *Georgius Cargius*, with *Abraham Scultetus*, were some of the "*virorum magnorum*" whose writings Dr. Gomar very obligingly undertook to correct, on the subject of justification. When the controversy on this subject arose, he came out decidedly and declared that "we are not justified by the active obedience of Christ."* And on Rom. 5: 19, he at once declares, that "the active obedience, or holy life of Christ is never said to be imputed to us for righteousness, and that if we were justified by it there would have been no necessity that Christ should die."† The following passages are found scattered about in his works: "To impute righteousness and to forgive sins are the same thing." "In respect to the formal cause of justification, I teach that justification is nothing but the forgiveness of sins." "They for whom Christ died are unrighteous, 1 Pet. 3: 8, but they to whom the active obedience of Christ is imputed are not unrighteous; therefore Christ did not die for those to whom his active obedience is imputed. And by consequence he died in vain." "The Scriptures never say that the active obedience of Christ is imputed to us for righteousness." "These phrases, to impute righteousness and to forgive sin, mean the same thing." "I admit that we should have that perfect obedience to the law which is obtained by imputation. But I affirm that this imputation is accomplished on account of Christ's passive obedience." "The law requires of us, either perfect obedience, or punishment."‡ These passages are sufficient to declare the sentiments of this great divine.

* "Obedientia Christi activa non justificamur."

† "Sed haec [scil. obedientia activa, sive sancta Christi vita] nusquam nobis ad justitiam imputari dicitur: et si illa justificati fuissimus, non esset opus ipsum mori."

‡ "Imputare justitiam, et remittere peccata esse idem. De causa formali justificationis doceo; justificationem, nihil aliud esse, quam remissionem peccatorum.—Pro quibus Christus mortuus est, illi sunt injusti, 1 Pet, 3: 8, illi quibus imputatur obedientia Christi activa, Christus mortuus non est. Et per consequens, frustra est mortuus.—Scripturam nusquam tradere, nobis ad justitiam, imputari obedientiam Christi activam.—Locutiones istae imputare justitiam, et remittere peccata, aequipollent.—Lex enim a nobis postulat aut perfectam obedientiam, aut poenam." The two following are from *Cargius*

V. The *Belgic Confession*. We had not the original of this Confession by us when we referred to it under a former topic; but we shall now present the reader with an extract from Art. 23, referring him to the margin for the Latin. "We rest entirely upon the alone obedience of Jesus Christ crucified upon the cross. That obedience becomes truly ours when we believe in him. Moreover, that obedience alone abundantly suffices for covering all our iniquities; and also for rendering us safe and secure against all temptations." "We believe that our entire happiness consists in the forgiveness of sins which is in Christ Jesus." "And that in this alone is contained our entire righteousness before God."*

It is really humiliating to see a man possessing the splendid genius and acquisitions of the venerable Gomar, descend to the wretched evasion which he adopts in relation to this Confession. In one of his treatises he takes occasion to refer to the fact that this symbol of the Belgic Church contradicted the views which he had adopted, of the doctrine of justification.

This was, as may be supposed, a most tender spot for him to touch upon; and accordingly, he endeavours to evade the objection by the ridiculous supposition that the Confession must have been corrupted! Though it was originally published in the *Harmony*, and in the *Body and Syntagma of Confessions* just as I have given it. And even in the wretchedly translated and miserably mutilated edition of the *Harmony*, recently published in America, and out of which every thing was left that the editors dared to leave out pertaining to the passive obedience of Christ, the passage remains just as we have given it, retaining still all the "corruptions" alleged to exist by Dr. Gomar. To such lengths will even the best of men go in support of a theory when once they have set their heart upon

above referred to. "Legem, aut ad obedientiam, aut ad poenam, non ad utrumque, obligare.—Quod Christus, pro nobis praestitit, ad id praestandum, nos non obligari."—*De curriculo vitae Abrahami Sculteti*: and *Pisc. Apol. pro Disp.*

* "Sola Jesu Christi crucifixi obedientia suffulti, in ea prorsus acquiescimus: quae quidem nostrae est, cum in eum credimus. Hoc porro una abunde sufficit ad omnes iniquitates nostras obtegendas, tum etiam ad nos tutos securosque reddendos, adversus omnes tentationes.—Credimus omnem felicitatem nostram sitam esse, in peccatorum remissione, quae est in Christo Jesu:—Unica, totam nostram justitiam coram Deo, contineri."

it. And thus would Gomar after having corrected the “errors” of the “great men” of the reformation, even venture to correct the confessions themselves; and thus prescribe for the orthodoxy of Christendom.

VI. Our next witness is Dr. Pareus, (born A. D. 1549). His views on this subject were partially expressed in the quotations from him which we made under a former topic.*

We now add the following. To the query “whether the passive righteousness of Christ is alone imputed to us for righteousness, or whether the active likewise,” he unhesitatingly answers “*the passive alone is imputed.*” “Scripture declares that the entire material of our righteousness, is in the suffering, cross, blood, and death of Christ: *therefore this alone is that on account of which we are justified.*” “The Scripture defines our whole justification by the forgiveness of sin, on account of the blood of Christ: Therefore the pouring out of his blood is that by the imputation of which we are justified; and the forgiveness of sins is our whole justification.” “Never have I read in the sacred Scriptures that our righteousness consists of two or three parts. Never have I read that the human sanctity of Christ imputed to us, is our righteousness, or even a part of it. If any one reads such a passage, I entreat that he will show it to me, that I also may read and believe. Never have I read this, of even his *actual* obedience.”†

In the following passage, (which is the last we shall quote from Pareus), he enters into an interesting explanation of this view. His words are, “The righteousness of the person, and the righteousness of the merit of Christ, as they ought not to be divided, so neither ought they to be confounded in justification. The reason is, because the Scripture itself distinguishes between the quality of the person of the Mediator meriting righteousness

* See Vol. XI. p. 463, etc.

† “Scriptura nostrae justitiae totam materiam ostendit in passione, cruce, sanguine, morte Christi: Ergo haec sola est res propter quam justificamur.—Scriptura totam justificationem nostram definit remissione peccatorum propter sanguinem Christi: ergo sola sanguinis effusio est id cujus imputatione justificamur: et remissio peccatorum est tota nostra justificatio.—Nusquam S. Scripturas sic tripartiri aut bipartiri justitiam nostram. Nusquam legi, sanctitatem humanam Christi nobis imputari, esse justitiam nostram, vel ejus partem. Si quis legit, quaeso mihi ostendat, ut et ego legam et credam. Nusquam etiam id lego de actuali obedientia.”

for us and the merit or righteousness itself, as between *former* and *latter*, or, as between cause and effect. As in Isaiah 53: 11, my righteous servant. Heb. 7: 26, Such an high priest became us, who etc. 2 Cor. 5: 20, Him who knew no sin, etc. 1 Pet. 3: 18, Christ once suffered the just for the unjust, etc. In these, and in similar places there is ascribed to Christ a two-fold righteousness; one, by which he himself was adorned; the other which he bestows upon us. When this distinction is neglected, much confusion follows, and it involves the doctrine in so many disadvantages, that it is extremely difficult to defend it against the papists and its other adversaries.”*

VII. *Dr. Amandus Polanus*. This is a divine, to whose testimony for several reasons, we invite special attention.† In solid learning he has been rarely surpassed: and with the reformed church his authority was considerable. Although perpetually quoted and referred to by both friends and foes, he has never yet been spoken of slightly. Another consideration that entitles him to attention is, he wrote his *System of Theology* after the disputes on justification and the obedience of Christ had entered the church, and he took the side opposite to Ursinus, Piscator, etc. In his *System of Theology* above quoted,

* “*Justitia personae, et justitia meriti Christi, ut non debent divelli, ita nec debent confundi, sed distingui in justificatione. Ratio est: quia Scriptura ipsa distinguit inter qualitatem personae mediatoris merentis nobis justitiam et meritum, vel justitiam ipsam, tanquam inter prius et posterius, ino tanquam inter causam et effectum: ut Jesai. 53: 11, ‘Servus meus justus;’ Heb. 7: 26, ‘Talis nobis conveniebat pontifex qui,’ etc.; 2 Cor. 5: 20, ‘Eum qui non novit peccatum,’ etc.; 1 Petr. 3: 18, ‘Christus semel passus est justus pro injustis,’ etc. His et similibus locis tribuitur Christo duplex justitia, quasi duplex vestis: una qua ipse ornatus fuit, altera quam nobis donat. Hic distinctione neglecta, multiplex confusio sequitur, et plurimus incommodis implicatur haec doctrina, ut difficilior contra Papistas et alios adversarios defendatur.*”

† Polanus is one of the few theologians who have framed a complete system of theology originally from the Bible. He began his immense *Syntagma* by diligently reading through the Hebrew and Greek originals; and carefully noting and arranging the various topics in their order. He obtained what helps he could, in the elucidation of obscure passages; and then by showing that the doctrines of the Scriptures, of the reformed church, and of the primitive church are the same, his stupendous efforts resulted in the production of the work from which we quote above.

he thus speaks in relation to the topic before us : "That perfect obedience which the law requires, does not consist in action only, but it is the conformity of our whole nature, and of all our actions, affections, and sufferings, with the law of God. If the Son of God suffered and died for us, then surely there has been a most sufficient satisfaction for us, *and we are in the fullest manner* redeemed, and cleansed from sin. *The effects of the death of Christ are, 1. Our reconciliation with God, Rom. 5: 10. 2. Liberty from the servitude of sin, death, and the devil: and liberty of entering the celestial holy of holies, by that new and living way which Christ consecrated for us through the vail, that is, through his flesh, John 8: 32, 36. Heb. 10: 19, 20. The suffering and death of the whole human nature of Christ, that is, the suffering and death, internal and external, of body and soul, is the most perfect satisfaction, and of infinite value.*"* Then, in speaking to the point whether Christ endured suffering in soul and body, he takes up and considers the following question : "If Christ suffered and died, not only in the body corporeally, but also in spirit spiritually, why then does the Scripture attribute *our entire salvation to the blood and death of Christ corporeally?* as in Rom. 3: 25, Eph. 1: 7, etc. To this I reply that the Scriptures when they attribute our whole salvation to the blood and death of Christ corporeally, speak synecdochically; naming a part for the whole. Ascribing it to that part which is most conspicuous, and most evident to the sight; that they may accommodate themselves to the vulgar; who are more easily impressed by what they see, than by what is made evident by ratiocination. Thus in the history of the creation of the world, visible creatures only are expressly de-

* "Obedientia perfecta, quam lex requirit, non est tantum actio, sed etiam conformitas totius naturae et omnium actionum, affectuum, passionumque cum lege Dei, p. 1173. Si Filius Dei pro nobis passus et mortuus est, tum profecto sufficientissime pro nobis satisfactum, et nos plenissime redempti et emendati a peccato sumus, p. 1234. Mortis effecta Christi sunt: 1. Reconciliatio nostri cum Deo, Rom. 5: 10.—2. Libertas a servitute peccati, mortis et diaboli, et libertas ingrediendi sacrarium coeleste ea via, quam Christus dedicavit nobis recentem et vivam per velum, hoc est per carnem suam. Joh. 8: 32, 36. Heb. 10: 19, 20, etc. p. 1264.—Passio et mors totius humanae naturae Christi, hoc est, passio et mors externa et interna, corporis et animae Christi, est satisfactio illa perfectissima atque infiniti pretii, p. 1268."

scribed; though it is certain that invisible creatures, were also then produced. So also in the places adduced above; the external and corporeal sufferings and death of Christ are spoken of: Not that his internal and spiritual suffering is excluded, but because his external and corporeal is much more apparent:" etc. p. 1271.* Here then Polanus asserts that our whole salvation is attributable to the passive obedience of Christ; and though not to the body and blood corporeally, yet to the *sufferings* of soul and body really.

While considering the following passages the reader will bear in mind that Polanus declares justification to be "a release from obligation to suffer punishment." "We were reconciled to God by the death of Christ while we were strangers and enemies by wicked works.—For the reprobate even, did Christ die as to the procuring of a sufficiency for their salvation. For the *death* of Christ is an expiation sufficient also for the reprobate, yea, even for a hundred thousand worlds, if they all would believe. So great is its value. But as to the efficacy of his death, he did not die for the reprobate.—All the sins of the elect, committed from the beginning of the world even until the end of it, are expiated by the blood of Christ. And for his sake are forgiven by God to those who believe."†

* "Si Christum non tantum corpore corporaliter, sed etiam anima spiritualiter passus et mortuus est: cur igitur Scriptura totam salutem nostram tribuant sanguini et morti Christi corporali? Rom. 3: 25. Eph. 1: 7. Col. 1: 20. Heb. 9: 12 et seq. 1 Pet. 1: 18, 19. 1 John 1: 7. Apoc. 1: 5 et 5: 9. Rom. 5: 10. Phil. 2: 8. *Respond.* Scripturae quae totam salutem nostram tribuunt sanguini et morti *corporali* Christi, synecdochicè loquuntur, partem pro toto nominantes, et quod est totius, tribuentes parti maxime conspicuae et in oculis incurrenti, ut se accommodent captui etiam infirmorum, qui facilius ea quae oculis videntur cognoscunt, quam quae ratiocinatione sunt perscrutanda. Sicut in historia creationis mundi describuntur expresse tantum visibiles creaturae, quum certum sit, etiam invisibiles creaturas tum productas fuisse. — Ita quoque in locis adductis externa atque corporalis passio et mors Christi inculcatur: non quod interna et spiritualis excludatur, sed tum quia externa atque corporalis maxime evidens fuit."

† "Per mortem Christi reconciliati fuimus Deo, cum ab alienati et hostes essemus, cum mente operibus malis intenti essemus." p. 1276. "Pro reprobis etiam Christus est mortuus, nimirum quoad sufficientiam. Nam mors Christi esset λίτρον sufficiens etiam pro reprobis, imo pro centies mille mundis, si omnes crederent: tantae est dignitatis.

Although when the discussion of this subject entered the reformed churches Polanus was inclined to take, (and ultimately in his *Syntagma* did take) the ground opposite to that occupied by Piscator, Ursinus, and all the primitive reformers ; yet take notice how very carefully he expresses his views in the subjoined passages lest he should be accused of having really and entirely abandoned, on this point, the doctrine of the reformation. He sees, that such a charge could be with reason, preferred ; and he endeavors to guard against the suspicion. The reader will be struck with the contrast between the views of this doctrine that he here advances, and those now affirmed to be orthodox. “ The righteousness of Christ,” says he, “ by which we are justified, far exceeds, and excels in comparison that eternal life which is given to us by God. *That we are justified by the payment made by Christ in our stead, of the punishment due to us, is not called into doubt. In the reformed churches this is agreed upon.* Therefore there is no need of proving it. For if a hundred thousand testimonies were produced, which taught *that we are justified by the blood of Christ*, that we have forgiveness of sin by the blood of Christ, it would be useless to us, for we also embrace this sentiment from our soul.” Polanus would never have taken all this pains to exculpate himself from the suspicion of having departed from the primitive view of the Reformation on this subject, unless he had been aware that his refinements had afforded some ground for indulging it. We meet with no such disclaimers in the writings of Ursinus, Pareus, Tilenus, Piscator, etc. though we meet them in abundance in the writings of Polanus and Gomar. The quotation continues as follows : “ To all this, we yet add, that Christ could not have been *our righteousness*, unless he had suffered and died for us. For by the work of suffering and dying he finished the work of redemption for us ; as our righteousness consists, in the most perfect fulfilment of the commands of the law, and particularly in his suffering and death, in our stead, which is the seal and crown of the whole obedience. We hesitate not to say with blessed Athanasius : It was not in the law that Christ overcame the devil and his angels, *neither was it there that he wrought out our salvation.*

Quoad efficaciam vero non est mortuus pro reprobis.” p. 1294.
 “ Omnia enim peccata electorum inde ab initio mundi commissa, et usque ad finem mundi committenda, sunt expiata sanguine Christi, et propter eum credentibus a Deo remissa.” p. 1301.

but it was upon the cross." "For without the obedience accomplished on the cross, the fulfilment of the commands of the law would have profited us nothing. Seeing that we were obligated to obedience, and also to punishment, on account of our transgressions."*

Here then is a writer, who, when the dispute on this subject commenced, took the contrary side to the generality of Calvinists, and yet has actually gone further towards denying the imputation of Christ's active obedience for justification, than have those brethren among us who have been loudly censured as unsound Calvinists. It is quite apparent, in the light of the testimony which we have thus far cited, that these brethren, (agreeably to what has latterly been denominated sound doctrine,) are more orthodox than the reformers themselves.† It

* "Justitia Christi per quam nos justificamur, proportionem longe superat et excellit vitam aeternam, quae nobis a Deo detur. Quod persolutione poenae a Christo loco nostro facta coram Deo justificamur, non vocatur in dubium, sed in Ecclesiis reformatis de eo consentitur: proinde nulla opus habet probatione: ac si centies mille testimonia extarent, quae docerent, nos sanguine Christi justificari, nos remissionem peccatorum habere in sanguine Christi, tantum id gratius nobis esset: nam et nos hoc ipsum ex animo amplectimur. Quinetiam hoc addimus: Christum non potuisse esse justitiam nostram, nisi pro nobis passus et mortuus esset. Patiendo enim et moriendo opus redemptionis nostrae complevit: sicut justitia nostra, et in mandatorum legis impletione perfectissima et praecipue in passione et morte pro nobis obita, quae totius obedientiae coronis atque obignatio est, consistat. Unde non dubitamus dicere cum b. Athanasio libro Quaestionum ad Antiochum Principem, respons. ad Quaest. 38. p. 285. tom. II. edit. Commelin.: 'Non in lege Christus diabolum evacuavit et daemones, neque in ea salutem operatus est, sed in cruce.' Quia absque obedientia in cruce praestita. Nihil nobis profuisset mandatorum legis impletio: quum non tantum ad implenda mandata legis, verum etiam ad poenam ab ejus transgressionem fuimus obligati." p. 1470.

† That this may be at once apparent, we beg leave here to subjoin a passage from Mr. Barnes's Defence, p. 257. Dr. Junkin considers this language itself as sustaining his charge. 'Vindication,' p. 132. "I have uniformly represented," says Mr. Barnes, "the doctrine as near as possible in the language of the Scriptures: that it was by his blood, his obedience unto death, his merits, his atoning sacrifice, his substituted sufferings, *his work alone*, that man could be justified and saved. I have always taught that men have no merits by nature, that they have done nothing, and can do nothing, to deserve eternal life; that

would be a curious inquiry, (though we shall not now institute it,) what would become of the Reformers themselves if they were now alive?

VIII. Even *Dr. Gomar*, who, in relation to the active obedience, took still higher ground than *Polanus* yet agrees substantially with the brethren referred to, as may be seen by the following passages, taken somewhat at random from his works: "The obedience of Christ by which we are righteous, and by which we are justified by God, that is, by which we are declared just, is not only a particular obedience performed in punishment due to us on account of sin; but the universal obedience of the whole law. Whence it also follows that the forgiveness of our sins, (understood without synecdoche,) that is absolution of the punishment due for our sins, because of the satisfaction of the suffering and death of Christ in our behalf, imputed to us by faith, is not the whole of our justification necessary for obtaining life eternal. But that the whole righteousness of the law, performed for us by Christ, is also necessary to obtain righteousness and eternal life." "The suffering and obedience of Christ from the beginning even until the end of it unite in one; and although the completion of the suffering placed in the article *death*, occupies the last place, in the order of *time*, yet in the order of justification the forgiveness of sins precedes; but the imputation of the righteousness of perfect obedience succeeds, because it implies the forgiveness of sins. Notwithstanding however, although they differ in the order, they are both accomplished at the same time by God in justification."*

they are lost, and hopeless, and ruined; and that if ever saved it must be by the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ alone. And that this has been the strain of my preaching, I may appeal boldly to all who have ever heard me, and to all my writings. No man ever heard me utter a sentiment in the pulpit, or elsewhere, that contravened this great central truth of Christianity. The charge, therefore, that I have denied that the "active obedience of Christ is imputed," etc. is wholly gratuitous and unfounded. It is neither contained in the passages quoted by the prosecutor from my book, nor is it to be found anywhere in what I have said or written."

* "Quare obedientia Christi, qua justī sumus, et a Deo justificamur, id est, justī judicamur, non est tantum obedientia particularis, in poena nobis debita, ob peccatum perferenda; sed universalis totius legis obedientia. Unde etiam sequitur, remissionem peccatorum nostrorum, sine synecdoche, acceptam, id est, poenae pro peccatis nostris debitae

IX. The following is the testimony of the Moravian Confession. "We obtain pardon of sins and are made righteous before God, by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith, *even by believing that Christ hath suffered for us.*" Here it is asserted that we obtain pardon and righteousness not by believing that Christ fulfilled the law for us by "*active obedience,*" but "*by believing that he suffered for us;*" his *passive obedience.* Art. IV.

X. *Synod of Dort.* Art. XXI. We now present the reader with the judgment of this famous Calvinistic Synod on the subject; and upwards of *fifty years* after the dispute was first agitated. It is deserving of especial notice, that though this article professes to state in detail, what Christ has done for his people, it yet never once alludes to his active obedience as having been performed for us. The following is the whole article.

"We believe that Jesus Christ is ordained with an oath to be an everlasting High Priest, after the order of Melchisedek. Who hath presented himself in our behalf before his Father, to appease his wrath by his full satisfaction, by offering himself on the tree of the cross, and pouring out his precious blood to purge away our sins; as the prophet had foretold. For it is written, He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed; He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and numbered with the transgressors; and condemned by Pontius Pilate as a malefactor, though he had first declared him innocent. Therefore, he restored that which he took not away, and suffered the just for the unjust, as well in his body as soul, feeling the terrible punishment that our sins had merited; insomuch that his sweat became like unto drops of blood falling on the ground. He called out, my God,

abolitionem, ob Christi pro nobis passi et mortui satisfactionem, per fidem nobis imputatam, non esse totam justificationem, ad vitam aeternam consequendam; necessariam: sed etiam universalem legis a Christo pro nobis praestitam justitiam, ad justitiam et vitam aeternam esse necessarium.—Christi passionem, et obedientiam, ab initio vitae ad mortem usque, conveniæ, ac licet passionis complementum, in morte positum, postremum tempore occupet locum, in ordine tamen justificationis, remissio peccatorum praecedit: imputatio vero obedientiae justitiae perfectae succedit; quia ea remissionem peccatorum supponit, ut in fine objectionis dictum. Utrumque tamen, licet ordine, differant, simul, a Deo justificante, peragitur."

my God, why hast thou forsaken me? And hath suffered all this for the remission of our sins—wherefore we justly say with the apostle Paul, that we know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified; we count all things but loss and dung for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord; in whose wounds we find all manner of consolation. *Neither is it necessary to seek or to invent any other means of being reconciled to God, than this only sacrifice, once offered, by which believers are made perfect forever.* This is also the reason why he was called by the angel of God, *Jesus*, that is to say, *Saviour*, because he should save his people from their sins."

The sentence which we have put in Italic was evidently pointed directly at those who were at that time distracting and perplexing the church with "inventing another means of being reconciled to God—and made perfect forever," than "this only sacrifice." That *new invention* of being "made perfect," was the *active obedience* scheme.

XI. *Tilenus* is our next witness.

The reader will have observed how expressly this writer in his testimony adduced by us under the first topic,* of this article, avows the doctrine here under consideration. We shall present from his admirable *Syntagma* of christian doctrine, a few additional quotations.

On pp. 723, 724, he thus speaks: "Thus far we have treated upon the efficient cause of justification. The object of it, when understood positively, is the making known of the glory of God, which shines forth in that most wise mingling and tempering of justice and mercy: For what justice requires of the Son as our surety, is by mercy imputed to us. Thus have we spoken of the efficient cause and end of justification. Now we shall offer a few things concerning its material and form; and vindicate it from the sophistry and abuses of our adversaries. The material of justification understood actively, is the satisfaction accomplished by Jesus Christ whom God hath set forth that he might be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness by the remission of sins, Rom. 3: 25; by which words the apostle intends to signify that our faith looks especially upon the sacrifice of Christ. This redemption is beheld not only in the death of the cross, although in this last act, and completion of the satisfaction, the Scripture

* See Vol. XI. p. 470 etc.

places it synecdochically : But it also appears in the preceding miseries and sorrows which from the beginning of his incarnation until his death, our surety suffered for us. The form of justification actively taken is the forgiveness of sins, and imputation of righteousness, which Christ, by his obedience even unto the death of the cross, performed for the Father, reserved for us, and applied to us by faith. But when justification is understood passively, its form is nothing but the application of faith : whence faith is called our righteousness. To the elect, therefore, when they are justified, all their sins of omission are forgiven as well as those commonly called sins of commission. This is certain. And therefore he whose sins are forgiven, appears before God, as if he had done no evil which the law forbids, and had left undone no duty which the law commands : *which certainly is a perfect, and, in all its parts, an absolute righteousness, in the divine estimation.* And to every one thus forgiven, the reward of eternal life is just as certain, as that the promise is true which says : Do this and live." And on page 1065, he thus speaks : "To forgive sins, to absolve from sins, to impute righteousness, not to impute sins, are not diverse parts of the benefit of justification, but denote only the various terms by which this act is expressed : Even as by the same act blackness is removed, and whiteness coated over a wall. Thus by the same act of judgment sin is forgiven, and righteousness imputed to man."*

* "Hactenus de efficiente justificationis. Finis ejus, cum active sumitur, est patefactio gloriae Dei, quae in sapientissima illa justitiae, et misericordiae *χρόσι* ac temperamento elucet. Nam quod a filio, tanquam a sponsore nostro exigit justitia : hoc nobis imputavit misericordia.—Dictum est de justificatione efficiente, et fine. Nunc ejusdem materiae et formae paucis declaranda, et ac adversariorum atrophis et fraudibus est vindicanda. Materia justificationis active sumptae, est satisfactio praestita per Christum quem Deus proposuit, ut esset *ἱλαστήριον* per fidem in sanguine ipsius, ad declarandam justitiam suam, per remissionem peccatorum, Rom. 3: 25, quibus verbis apostolus significat, fidem nostram sacrificium Christi potissimum intueri. Haec *ἀπολύτρωσις* spectanda est non solum in morte crucis, quamvis in hoc ultimo actu, et satisfactionis complemento, scriptura eam collocet synecdochiae ; sed etiam in antecessis miseriis et aerumnis, quas jam inde a primordio incarnationis, nostra causa perpesus est sponsor noster. — Forma justificationis active sumptae, est remissio peccatorum, et imputatio justitiae, quam Christus obedientia sua, Patri usque ad mortem crucis praestita, nobis peperit, ac nobis

The reader cannot but be impressed with the striking similarity existing in the language, and in the modes of explanation adopted by all these venerable men on the first and last topics which are the subject of this article. It proclaims how wonderful the harmony must have been, in the sentiments entertained by all the primitive reformers on the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ.

Upon the nature of the foregoing quotations we deem it altogether unnecessary to detain the reader by a single additional remark. It might be expected that we should here close this protracted catalogue of authorities. But we beg to be indulged in bringing forward one more. Several reasons conspire to lead us to do so. The author's name has ever been an honored one with the followers of Calvin; he wrote at a period later than any whom we have quoted on this point.* He allows the distinction between the passive and active obedience of Christ; and, (what may be thought very singular,) he takes up and fully answers all the leading arguments, which, in our day are urged, and insisted on in defence of the imputation of Christ's active obedience to the elect; and in like manner disposes of all the objections urged against the imputation of the passive obedience alone. The reader will have observed, that, to some extent, this has been done in the preceding quotations. But here it is done more at length.

XII. *Wendeline* is the author referred to. In the first book of his *Christian Theology*, Chap. XXV. page 576—581, we meet with the following: "Thus far have we treated upon

per fidem applicat. Passive cum sumitur justificatio, forma ejus nihil aliud est, quam fidei applicatio, unde fides dicitur justitia nostra.—Cum igitur electis, qui justificantur, omnia peccata remittantur, tam ista, quae omissionis, quam illa, quae commissionis vulgo vocantur, remitti, certum est. Ac proinde is cui remissa sunt peccata, non solum eo loco habetur coram Deo, ac nihil mali, quod lex vetat, commisisset, sed etiam, ac si nihil boni, quod lex imperat, omisisset: quae certe perfecta, et omnibus numeris absoluta est justitia, aestimatione divina, cuique tam certo tribuitur vitae aeternae praemium, quam vera est haec promissio: Hoc fac, et vivea. — Remittero peccata, absolvere a peccatis, imputare justitiam, non imputare peccata, non diversas hujus beneficii partes, sed diversos duntaxat terminos hujus actus denotant. Nempe ut eodem actu tollitur nigredo, et albedo aspergitur parieti: sic eodem judicio, et peccatum remittitur, et justitia homini imputatur."

* His *System of Theology* was published A. D. 1633.

the *efficient* of justification. Its *material* is usually called that, *by, and on account of which*, we are before the divine tribunal absolved from the curse of the law, and accounted righteous and innocent. It is the perfect satisfaction of Christ for us; by which the punishment due to us on account of sin, he himself suffered in our stead. It is sometimes called the righteousness and passive obedience of Christ.

“ But in order to explain this yet more clearly, I remark,

I. That when we call the satisfaction of Christ, the *material* of our justification, we use the common language in relation to it. But it is sometimes rightly called the *meritorious cause* of our justification; forasmuch as it is on account of this imputed, that we are accounted righteous, and freed from the curse of the law. But in another respect the merit of Christ is the cause of our effectual calling and justification. For it is the cause of such calling, absolutely considered, inasmuch as it precedes faith. It is also the cause of justification, respectively considered, that is, with respect to faith; because we are not justified by the merit of Christ, unless it be apprehended by faith.

II. “ But here it is to be observed, that there is a twofold obedience of Christ, active and passive. The active obedience is that by which Christ spent his life in conformity to the law of God, perfectly observing all its commandments; whence it is said there was no guile in him, Is. 53: 9, that he knew no sin, 2 Cor. 5: 21. He did no sin, 1 Pet. 2: 22. He was tempted in all points without sin, Heb. 4: 15. The passive obedience is that by which he sustained for us the curse of the law to which we were obnoxious on account of sin. This was by suffering and dying for us, and therefore by enduring the punishment in our stead. Whence Paul says Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, when he was made a curse for us, Gal. 3: 13.

III. “ Both these obediences of Christ are essentially necessary to our redemption and justification, yet not in the same manner; from each of them life redounds unto us, but not in the same mode. For the active obedience is the condition required in the Mediator, without which Christ could not have been our Mediator; and without which, his death could have availed us nothing. In the meantime, however, this obedience if we speak properly and accurately, is not a material of our justification, *nor is it imputed to us so as to be accounted ours*, and on account of which our sins are forgiven, and the claims

of the law against us, satisfied ; in like manner as the passive becomes ours by imputation, and for which, sins are remitted to us ; and the claims of the law satisfied. This is proved thus :

(1.) “ Christ, so far as he was man, owed his active obedience to the law for himself ; for every creature is bound to obey his Creator. And should God privilege any man to conduct himself disorderly, he would thereby overturn the order of his righteousness, as the scholastics teach. Therefore that obedience is not imputed to us. The reason of the consequence is sought *à pari* ; forasmuch as it is plain that if Christ was obligated to the law to die for himself, and if he did die under these circumstances, he could not have imputed that to us, nor could he have released us by it.

“ But it is objected, that Christ was made man not for himself, but for us ; therefore it was not for himself, but for us, that is in our stead, that he performed the active obedience to the law. To this I answer 1. That the *antecedent* is ambiguous. If you mean that Christ was made man for us, that is, for our good, it is admitted : But if you mean that he was made man in our stead, it is denied. Because, what Christ was made, and did in our stead, we are not obligated to do or to be. Even as he was made a curse for us, lest we should become an everlasting curse. But by his incarnation Christ did not accomplish this ; viz. that we should no longer be men, or be bound to act agreeably to human nature. 2. The *consequence* is denied. For even if Christ was made man, not for himself but for our benefit ; yet, after he became man he was a man by himself, and therefore by himself and for himself, obnoxious to the law, as man. In the same manner as he was obnoxious to corruption after he had assumed a body. He also for himself had need of food, drink, rest, etc.

(2.) “ If Christ performed active obedience in our stead, so that it is imputed to us for righteousness, we are no longer obliged to perform active obedience to the law. But the consequence is false, and therefore the antecedent likewise. The reason of the connection is likewise sought *à pari*. Forasmuch as we are not obligated to suffer eternal death, because Christ suffered the penalty in our stead. But some persons object to this and say that the active obedience performed by Christ for us, is the cause of meriting eternal life ; and that we are no longer obliged to the obedience of the law on this account. *But we deny that the cause of deserving eternal life, is the active obedience of Christ performed in our stead.* The reason is,

because, that as a creature he owed it simply for himself: for it was not possible he should be from under the law. And therefore by it there is nothing of desert flows to us: nor could there be, even if he had performed it, intending thereby our greatest good.

“Those who say, that through the active obedience of Christ we are no longer obligated to a rigid and exact obedience, can hardly reconcile their sentiment with the truth. For if we are no longer obligated to the exact obedience of the law, then, we should not sin by neglecting it, or ceasing to obey it, which is false. We are therefore bound to obey it entirely; and our defections are forgiven because of the imputed—not *active but—passive obedience* of Christ the Mediator. And by degrees he perfects sanctification, which the Mediator merited also by his suffering.

(3.) “Everywhere the Scripture, when it speaks of justification and our cleansing from sin, and of its forgiveness, makes mention not of the active, but of the passive obedience of Christ. Among other testimonies of Scripture the following are distinguished passages.—Is. 53: 5, 6, By the bruise of the Messiah we are healed. God hath laid on him the iniquities of us all. Rom. 3: 24, 25, We are all justified by grace, by his grace, through the redemption accomplished in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth, that he might be a propitiation through faith in his blood. Rom. 5: 9, Being justified by his blood, much more shall we now be saved from wrath; and verse 10, We have been reconciled to God by the death of his Son. Gal. 3: 13, Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law when he was made a curse for us. 1 John 1: 7, The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin. Similar passages occur all through the Bible.

IV. “But others argue in favor of the contrary sentiment as follows. (1.) Two things are required for salvation, a liberation from death, and a gift of life. The former is obtained by the expiation of sin through suffering, the latter by the gift of righteousness, or of the active imputed obedience of Christ. To this I answer, *That the passive obedience of Christ expiates sin and gives life*; because life is obtained for us from the death of Christ. He died, that he might liberate us from death, and that being dead he might bestow life.

(2.) “It is objected that Christ not only offered himself unto death for us, but he also sanctified himself for us; that we

might be sanctified through the truth, John 17: 19. Therefore the holiness of Christ, and also his righteousness or active obedience is imputed to us. To this I answer that the consequence is denied; 1. The holiness of Christ assists us in the obtainment of holiness, even though it be not imputed to us, as we have explained above. 2. In the passage quoted in the objection, the active obedience of Christ is not to be understood by sanctification; but his determination and preparation for entering upon the sacerdotal office.

(3.) "It is also objected that the actual disobedience of Adam constituted us sinners; and that therefore the actual obedience of Christ must constitute us righteous. But I answer, that if by the *actual* obedience of Christ, mentioned in the conclusion, his *active* obedience is to be understood (for the *passive* obedience of Christ may itself be properly called *actual*), we deny the consequence. For whatever we have lost by the disobedience of Adam, is restored to us by the passive obedience of Christ imputed, which alone he accomplished in our stead; although he also performed the active for our benefit, as we have above explained.

(4.) "It is further objected that with the passive obedience of Christ his active obedience is also united; and that therefore one cannot be imputed to us without the other. But the consequence is denied: for what are even united, may yet nevertheless be distinct, and therefore as one can be contemplated without the other, so one may in like manner be imputed. In the mean time we do not deny that the voluntary sufferings of Christ, that is, his suffering conjoined with the action and readiness of the will, is imputed to us. But this is not the active obedience of Christ concerning which we now speak, and which, as a man, Christ owed the law. For as he was not, as man obligated to die, so neither was he obliged to a promptitude of dying.

(5.) "If only the passive obedience of Christ is imputed to us, says the objector, it would follow that only a half Christ was given to us, viz. a suffering, and not an acting one. But the consequence is false; and therefore so must be the antecedent. The assumption is proved, because he was given wholly to us, Is. 9: 6. But I reply, that the consequence of the connection is denied. For it is one thing to be given to us, and quite another thing to be imputed to us. Even the humanity and deity

of Christ were given to us, neither of which was therefore imputed to us.

*“ Truly, theirs is a horrible opinion, who deny that the passive obedience of Christ is imputed to us for righteousness, and that it is the cause of our obtaining the reward of eternal life ! For how can the blood of Christ cleanse us from all sin, if it is not the cause of our righteousness ? How did Christ give his flesh for the life of the world, if through him life is not restored to us ? How are we healed by the bruise of the Messiah ; if through him we are not sanctified ? How is the death of Christ our life, if by it life is not allotted to us ? There can be no middle condition between absolution from the curse of the law, and the blessing and right of eternal inheritance.”**

* *Thes. VII.* “ Hactenus efficiens justificationis : Materia ejus id appellari solet, per et propter quod coram tribunali divino a maledictione legis, absolvimur, et innocentes ac justii reputamur : est id perfecta Christi pro nobis satisfactio, qua poenas propter peccata nobis debitas nostro loco ipse luit : alias appellatur justitia ex obedientia Christi passiva.”

Explicatio. I. “ Quando Christi satisfactionem appellamus materiam nostrae justificationis, cum vulgo loquimur : alias eadem recte appellatur causa meritoria nostrae justificationis, siquidem propter hanc imputatam justii censemur et a maledictione legis absolvimur. Diverso autem respectu Christi meritum est causa vocationis et justificationis. Nam vocationis causa est absolute consideratum, siquidem praecedat ea fides : justificationis causa idem est respective consideratum, hoc est, cum respectu ad fidem, quia non justificamur per Christi meritum, nisi fide apprehensum. II. Hic vero observandum : duplicem esse Christi obedientiam, nempe activam et passivam. Activa obedientia est qua Christus conformem divinae legi vitam egit, omnia ejus mandata perfecte observando : unde dicitur dolus in ipso non fuisse, Jesiae 53: 9. Non novisse peccatum, 2 Cor. 5: 21. Non fecisse peccatum, 1 Pet. 2: 22. Tentatus in omnibus absque peccato, Heb. 4: 15. Passiva est, qua maledictionem legis, cui nos propter peccata eramus obnoxii, nostro loco sustinuit, patiundo pro nobis et moriendo, adeoque poenam nostro loco persolvendo. Unde Paulus Gal. 3: 13. Christus nos redemit ab execratione legis, dum factus est pro nobis execratio.”

III. “ Utraque haec Christi obedientia ad nostri redemptionem et justificationem omnino est necessaria, non tamen eodem modo : ab utraque ad nos redundat salus, sed non eodem modo. Nam obedientia activa est conditio in mediatore requisita, absque qua mediator noster Christus esse non potuisset, suaque morte nihil promereri potuisset. Interim tamen obedientia haec, si proprie et accurati lo-

He next proceeds to answer the objection that "the law is not fulfilled by the endurance of punishment ; and that there-

quainur, non est materia nostrae justificationis, nec imputatur nobis, ita ut noster censeatur, et nobis propter eam peccata remittantur et debitum legis pro nobis solvatur : quemadmodum passivam per imputationem censetur nostra, et propter eam peccata nobis remittuntur : debitumque nostro loco solvitur : probatur hoc : (1) Christus, quatenus homo, obedientiam, legi activam, pro se debuit : tenetur enim creatori suo obedire omnis creatura, neque magis indulgere Deus homini potest, ut ἀτάκτως se geret, quam justitiae suae ordinem evertere, ut recte Scholastici docent. Ergo obedientia illa nobis non imputatur."

"Ratio consequentiae a pari petitur : siquidem eadem ratione : si Christus mortem legi pro se debuisset et praestitisset, nobis imputare eam, et per eam nos liberare non potuisset."

"Excipitur : Christus non pro se, sed pro nobis factus est homo. Ergo non pro se, sed pro nobis, hoc est, nostro loco, obedientiam legi activam praestitit. Respondeo I. Antecedens ambiguum : si dicas Christum factum esse hominem pro nobis, hoc est, nostro bono, conceditur : si pro nobis, hoc est, nostro loco, negatur. Quod enim Christus nostro loco fecit et factus est, id nos non tenemur facere et fieri : veluti pro nobis factus est execratio, ne nos essemus et teneremur, esse aeterna execratio. Atqui incarnatione sua Christus hoc non est consecutus est, ut nos amplius homines non essemus, vel teneremur humanae naturae congrua facere. II. Consequentia negatur. Etiam si enim Christus non suo, sed nostro bono factus est homo : tamen postquam factus est homo, per se homo fuit, ideoque per se et pro se legi obnoxius, qua homo : quemadmodum postquam corpus per se corruptioni obnoxium assumpsit, pro se quoque opus habuit cibo, potu, quiete, etc."

(2.) "Si nostro loco activam obedientiam Christus praestitisset, ita ut ad justitiam ea nobis imputaretur, nos ad obedientiam activam legi praestandam amplius obligati non essemus. Atqui falsum consequens : ergo et antecedens. Connexi ratio itidem a pari petitur : siquidem ideo ad aeternam mortem sustinendam nos amplius obligati non sumus, quia Christus nostro loco eam sustinuit."

"Excipiunt nonnulli : Christum pro nobis activam obedientiam praestitisse vitae aeternae promerendae causa : Hoc vero nomine nos amplius ad obedientiam legis non obligari. Resp. Negamus, vitae aeternae promerendae causa Christum loco nostro activam obedientiam praestitisse. Ratio est : quia eam pro se simpliciter debuit tanquam creatura, quae exlex esse non potest : adeoque per eam nobis nihil promeritus est, etiam si maximo nostro bono eam praestitit."

"Qui dicunt, per obedientiam Christi activam nos habere, quod amplius ad rigidam illam et exactam obedientiam activam obligati non simus : cum veritate sententiam suam vix conciliabunt. Nam si

fore the endurance of punishment cannot be the cause of our obtaining the reward, or eternal life," but as Ursinus, Pareus, and

ad exactam legis obedientiam amplius obligati non essemus, utique non peccaremus ejus intermissione et neglectu, quod falsum. Sinus igitur omnino ad eam obligati: defectus autem condonatur propter imputam, non activam, sed passivam mediatoris Christi obedientiam: paulatimque per sanctificationem suppletur, quam passione quoque sua mediator est promeritus."

(3.) "Ubique scriptura, quando loquitur de justificatione nostri et purgatione a peccatis, eorumque remissione, non activae, sed passivae obedientiae Christi mentionem facit. Inter alia scripturae testimonia hanc in sententiam insignia sunt: Jesiae 53: 5, 6, Livore ejus [nempe Messiae] sanati sumus. [Deus]; Conjecit in eum iniquitates omnium nostrum. Rom. 3: 24, 25, Omnes justificamur gratis, ejus gratia, per redemptionem factam in Christo Jesu, quem Deus proposuit, ut esset placamentum per fidem in sanguine ipsius. Rom. 5: 9, Justificati ejus sanguine servabimur nunc multo magis ab ira: et vers. 10, Reconciliati fuimus Deo per mortem filii. Gal. 3: 23, Christus redemit nos ab execratione legis cum factus est pro nobis execratio. 1 John 1: 7, Sanguis Jesu Christi purgat nos ab omni peccato. Similia passim occurrunt."

IV. "In contrariam sententiam alii ita disputant: (1.) Ad salutem nostram duo requiruntur: liberatio a morte, et donatio vitae: illa, peccati per passionem expiatione, haec dono justitiae, seu obedientiae Christi activae imputatae obtinetur. Resp. Obedientia Christi passiva et peccata expiat, et vitam donat, quia ex morte Christi vita nobis obtingit: ipse mortuus est, et e morte nos liberaret et mortuus vitam donaret."

(2.) "Christus non solum pro nobis in mortem se obtulit, sed etiam seipsum pro nobis sanctificavit, ut simus ipsi sanctificati per veritatem. John 17: 19, Ergo sanctitas quoque Christi et justitia seu obedientia activa nobis imputatur. Resp. Consequentia negatur: 1. Sanctitas Christi nobis ad sanctitatem prodest, etiamsi nobis non imputatur, ut supra explicavimus. 2. In allegato loco per sanctificationem Christi non intelligitur activa ejus obedientia: sed destinatio et praeparatio ejus ad officium sacerdotale obeundum."

(3.) "Actualis inobedientia Adami nos peccatores constituit. Ergo actualis Christi obedientia nos constituit justos. Resp. Si in consequente per actualem Christi obedientiam intelligitur activam (nam et passiva potest appellari actualis, quia actu, non potentia tantum, passus est Christus, eaque nobis imputata,) consequentiam negamus. Quicquid enim per inobedientiam Adami admissimus id restituit nobis obedientia Christi passiva imputata, quam solam nostro loco praestitit: etsi et activam nostro bono praestitit; ut ante diximus."

(4.) "Cum obedientia Christi passiva etiam conjuncta fuit activa. Ergo una sine altera nobis non imputatur. Resp. Consequentia negatur: nam et quae conjuncta sunt, nihilominus distincta sunt, adeo-

Tilenus have already abundantly answered this objection in the preceding quotations, we think it unnecessary to add here the answer of Wendeline.

This author has never been, by the most rigid of Calvinists, accused of heresy. His work has been, ever since its first appearance, esteemed as one of the most admirable text books of Calvinistic Theology. To those who are acquainted with the works of Wendeline, his very dust itself is precious.* For another reason the work from which the preceding extract is taken, is entitled to the utmost regard from all the followers of Calvin. Its author drew the entire materials of which it is composed, from the works of the great leading Calvinistic

que ut unum sine alio potest cognosci, ita et imputari. Interim non negamus, passionem Christi voluntarium, hoc est, cum actione et promptitudine voluntatis conjunctam, nobis imputari, sed hoc nihil ad obedientiam Christi activam, de qua in specie hic loquimur, quam qua homo, legi Christus debuit: Nam ut ad mortem, qua homo, non fuit obligatus, ita nec ad promptitudinem moriendi."

(5.) "Si passiva Christi obedientia tantum nobis imputaretur, sequeretur, dimidium tantum Christum nobis datum, nempe patientem, non agentem. Atqui falsum consequens: ergo et antecedens. Assumptio probatur quia totus nobis est datus, Is. 9: 6. Resp. Connexi consequentia negatur: aliud enim est nobis dari, aliud nobis imputari: Etiam Christi humanitas et Deitas nobis est data, neutra tamen propterea nobis imputatur. Certe dura est sententia eorum, qui negant obedientiam Christi passivam nobis imputari ad justitiam et esse praeinii, seu vitae aeternae causam. Qui enim sanguis Christi nos purgaret ab omni peccato, si nostrae justitiae causa non esset? Qui carnem suam Christus dedisset pro mundi vita, si per eum vita nobis non restitueretur? Qui livore Messiae essemus sanati: si per eum non essemus sanctificati? Qui mors Christi nostra esset vita, si per eam vita nobis non obtingeret? Inter absolutionem a maledictione legis et benedictionem atque jus aeternae haereditatis status medius non datur."

* The writer being from home a few weeks since, stopped at the house of a venerable clergyman who claims to be an old-school Calvinist, both in doctrines and in measures. He possesses a great many very valuable works of the reformers. The subject of their merits as theologians was introduced and discussed; in the course of which the venerable father observed that he had "two volumes of an old writer with which he would not part for their weight in silver, unless he could replace them." I inquired the name of the old divine. My friend could not just then recollect it; but going into his study he brought out and laid upon the table before me two quarto volumes of the works of Wendeline.

divines who had preceded him. Amongst whom he names Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, Ursinus, Pareus, Scultetus, Tilenus, "and others" says he, "whom it would be tedious to enumerate; and with whom I believe it to be more safe to speak and to think, than to labor after singularities and innovations."*

We regret the necessity of omitting a number of other, excellent witnesses. But both the time and the limits assigned us forbid us to extend this essay any further than to add a few remarks, suggested by the preceding discussion.

Conclusion.

One of the devout aspirations of *Martin Luther*, was "May the Lord deliver his church from the vain-glorious teacher, from the contentious pastor, and from unprofitable questions."† Our heart responds *amen* to this prayer. It is not therefore our wish by anything we here present, to engender strife: but merely to offer a few passing remarks, which may be worthy of consideration.

1. It may be thought by some that we might have taken up and considered the remaining specifications of alleged error in the case alluded to on the preceding pages. One reason for declining this is that the present essay is already of sufficient length. In addition to this we beg leave to remark 1. That with respect to the remaining specifications, it is universally admitted that they are not of equal importance with those which we have considered. 2. Of the ten, we have selected the three, to which the greatest importance has been attached by those brethren who have sympathized with the prosecutor in this case. 3. Those brethren have themselves rendered such examination unnecessary, by their own repeated avowals and declarations. For it has been alleged by almost every individual who has taken a prominent stand on that side of the controversy, that

* "Ad commentarios concinnandos liberalem operam contulerunt *præstantissimi* quique *Ecclesiarum nostrarum doctores*; Calvinus, Beza, Martyr, Zanchius, Ursinus, Perkinsonius, Pareus, Pitiscus, Scultetus, Wittakerus, Sutlivius, Molinaeus, Chamierus, Tilenus, Junius, Sibrandus, Bucanus, Amesius, et alii, quos recensere longum foret: cum quibus et loqui et sentire tutius esse arbitror, quam novitatibus et singularitatibus studere." *Vide Prefat.* p. 27, 28.

† "A doctore glorioso, et pastore contentioso, et inutilibus quaestionibus liberet Ecclesiam suam Dominus." Luth. Opp. tom. I. p. LV.

the whole series of charges comprises *errors of such a nature*,* that to a logical mind, the admission of either of the prominent ones, must of necessity carry with it the admission of all the series: because such minds err systematically, and these *errors* constitute “a system of Gospel subverting,” and “reformation-abandoning doctrine.” If this be sound argumentation, then, as no one can refuse to acknowledge that all the forequoted authors, were men of logic, learning and acuteness, they must by consequence, (and along with them all the first reformers without exception,) have been guilty of entertaining the whole number of specifications of alleged heresy. And if this be so, where is the necessity of entering into a similar discussion of the remaining topics?

We had intended, however, to include in the present essay, an examination of the views entertained by the Reformers, on the only remaining topic, to which the brethren of whom we speak have united in attaching serious importance. We mean the topic of *imputation*. We cannot now, however, do more than remark, that the reformers universally *deny* that the essential righteousness of the God-man Mediator becomes ours. They reject the idea with abhorrence: and perpetually speak of our being regarded as righteous on account of the merit of Christ, on account of the death of Christ, for the sake of Christ.† These are their almost unvaried expressions with regard to it.

The foregoing quotations, have, however, made this doctrine plain, as held by these venerable men. It is therein declared at once, how plain and simple were their views, as contrasted with those now claimed by some to be “*old school*” and orthodox. *Sin, when punished, is imputed: when forgiven, or not punished, it is not imputed. The imputation of righteousness is the forgiveness of sins: and this is done “by, and on account of” what Christ has suffered for us.* This is the sum total of the doctrine as they held it, (as the preceding quotations themselves evince,) and what can be more rational and scriptural!

2. There have been grievous charges preferred against a large portion of the clergy in this country, to this effect, that they persist in vexing the church by the introduction and use

* See ‘Vindication,’ p. 28—32, together with the Reports of the trial at York and Pittsburg.

† Their words are “*propter meritum Christi, propter Christum, propter mortem Christi,*” etc.

of a new phraseology. But on whom, agreeably to the preceding quotations, must this charge now rest? Are those who tenaciously adhere, (though it has cost them loss of comfort, reputation, if not life itself, indirectly in some instances,) to the very language of the reformation in relation to its distinctive doctrine, to be branded as *new lights*, *innovators*, and *the inventors of a new theological nomenclature*? Who is, in truth and reality, guilty of this charge? I will state a simple undorned fact, and leave it with the reader. It is this: the originators of the scheme of the imputation of Christ's active obedience, were in their day reproached by the Reformers with thus perplexing the church. And they attempted to justify themselves on the ground that a perspicuous and correct theology required such distinctions to be observed.

3. If the Reformers entertained correct views of the doctrine of Justification, Faith, and the Obedience of Christ, (which it would be absurd for Calvinists to deny,*) then, as the views which the brethren of whom we have above spoken, entertained of these doctrines, were the great cause of their attempted ejection from the church, it follows from what has appeared, that, had the counsels of their assailants prevailed, they would have been expelled from a professedly Calvinistic community, for entertaining the very doctrines on these subjects, which were taught by Calvin himself, and all his immediate followers; while at the same time, those who have attempted their expulsion have agreeably to their own showing, radically departed from these doctrines. A *radical* departure, on their own acknowledged principles, is syllogistically demonstrable. Because in a great variety of expressions they have declared, that, between their views on these subjects, and the views of those whom they have attempted to exclude, "there is not any agreement; and there ought not to be any compromise." So different indeed, that the one party has declared that, on the principles of the other, they cannot "read their title clear, to mansions in the skies."† If, then, there be this great and radical difference, who, (and we press the inquiry with deep

* "The creeds of the reformers do not need revising; and if they did, the men are probably not living to whom the task could be left with safety." See Sermon by C. C. Cuyler, D. D. of Philadelphia, preached before the synod of Philadelphia, at its session in York, Pa. Oct. 1835.

† See "Vindication," and "Trial of Rev. Albert Barnes."

and solemn interest,) who are the persons that have thus radically departed from the doctrines and principles of the Reformation?

It has always been the boast of Presbyterians that the Confession and Catechisms of their Church, contain an admirable and unadulterated epitome of the doctrines of the reformation; at least on the subject of Justification, the Obedience of Christ, and Imputation. Here again we press the inquiry, and ask, If this be so, who are the individuals that have really departed from the true sense of the standards?

If the ground is to be taken, that the commonly called old-school brethren have improved on the views of the Reformation, let the stand be taken boldly and openly; and let the world hear no more of the charge which they have been for years urging against *their brethren*, that *they* have departed from these principles! Or if the ground be assumed that the views of the Reformers are reconcilable with our standards, let us hear no more of this radical, and uncompromisable difference. *If they are reconcilable let them be reconciled*; that harmony and confidence may again be found within the borders of the lacerated, but blood-bought Zion of our God.

The plain and simple question, which, if answered categorically, will terminate at once the controversy, at least virtually, is the following: Were the reformers heretics on the subject of justification? Let this question be answered either affirmatively or negatively, and let the answer be given fearlessly. If the noble army of reformers are to be denounced as heretics, and at once excluded, let it be known. If they are to be recognized, let it be known.

If it be contended, that the men whose testimony we have adduced, were in error on these subjects, we demand to know what is to be our standard by which to judge of the theology of the first reformers? Creeds framed subsequently cannot be our criterion, if we find in them an acknowledged departure from the principles originally inculcated; and for the same reason, men who lived subsequently cannot be our guide, if they in like manner openly abandon and attempt the correction of what was primitively taught.

4. By these remarks it is not our intention to widen the breach in the walls of the city of our God, but to repair it. We will therefore urge upon the attention of all concerned in these controversies, another subject for consideration, which may as-

sist them in disentangling themselves from their difficulties. We have already seen that disputes arose in the church in the beginning of the seventeenth century, some of which were upon the topics discussed in this article. Polanus and Gomar disputed on faith, and yet their love and confidence in each other were not impaired. Two Calvinists of the most rigid sect, were, in A. D. 1604, drawn into a controversy with each other on the subject of faith and the obedience of Christ. They were Drs. *Tilenus* and *Molinaeus*. The former took the ground attributed to him in this essay, whilst Dr. *Molinaeus* occupied a stand somewhat different. The controversy was long and exciting, (and led ultimately to the action of the French synod previously spoken of;) but it was at length amicably settled. "Each," as a contemporary remarks,* "persisting in retaining his own views of the matter, and yet each acknowledging the other as orthodox." Go thou and do likewise.

If there was a desire deeply felt by the great men of the reformation, it was this, that there might be a concentration of christian effort in the great work of pulling down the strong holds of sin, and glorifying their God and Saviour. Of all the first men of the reformation, there were scarcely two between whom there was not more or less difference in their views of some points in theology. Nor was it their primary care to compose these differences. They knew that with frail, erring men, it would be vain to seek an entire conformity of sentiment on every point: and hence they gave that over, and sought union of effort. It is truly affecting to review their unceasing exertions to attain to this object. We have referred to the Marpurgense Colloquy, between the Lutheran ministers and those of Helvetia: they instituted one similar, and for a similar purpose, 1537. In 1570, a similar effort was made by the adherents to the Confessions of Augsburg, Bohemia, and Helvetia. In 1575, the same was attempted by those denominated Hussites and Waldensian brethren in the kingdom of Bohemia, and likewise the followers of the Augsburg symbol: many other instances could be specified if necessary. Let us learn to imitate their example in this respect, for it is worthy of imitation.

* "Quae contentio, interventu Domini de Plessis et aliorum quorundam doctorum, eum in modum sublata est, ut alter alterum pro orthodoxo doctore agnoverit, utroque interea in sententia sua persistente." Vide Orationem Grotii habitam in senatu Amstelrodamensi, anno 1616, opp. Theol. tom. IV. p. 179, col. 2.

Luther has finely remarked, "I have learned that he is not a theologian who knows great things, and who can teach many things; but he who lives holily, and as becomes the gospel." *

If the private declarations were called for of such men as Melancthon, Bucer, Zanchius, Pareus, etc. on the subject of the importance of union among those who unite in their reception of the doctrines of grace, we could fill pages with them.

Such then was the church, when in the hands of the blessed men whom God so signally honored as the instruments of reclaiming it to vitality and righteousness. And if there is a prayer to which our inmost soul will fervently respond, it is that of the feeling and experimentally pious Bernard, which we would adapt to our own day. "Quis mihi det, antequam moriar, videre Ecclesiam Dei, sicut in diebus antiquis." †

Who can tell what blessings the great Head of the church may have in store for his people? The composing of the unhappy differences which have so long palsied their very best energies, and led them to turn against each other those weapons which are mighty to pull down the strong holds of Satan, may be the signal of the returning favor of the Messiah. It is a test of love and obedience that he has the right to require at our hands; and it may be the signal of his bursting the fetters of paganism, and of his raining down righteousness upon America, till she shall bud and blossom as the garden of God. "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in my house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it. —And all nations shall call you blessed; for ye shall be a delightful land, saith the Lord of hosts."

* "Ego hoc video, non esse theologum, qui magna sciat, et multa doceat: sed qui sancte et theologicè vivat." *Vide Prefat. Luth. in Psal. ad Theologiae Studiosos.*

† "Oh that, before I die, I may behold the church of God as it was in ancient days!"

ARTICLE VIII.

CAUSES OF THE DENIAL OF THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE
PENTATEUCH.

Translated from the German of Prof. Hengstenberg of Berlin. By Rev. E. Ballantine, Assistant Instructor in the Union Theol. Sem. Prince Edward, Va. [Concluded from Vol. XI. p. 448.]

Naturalism.

HAVING shown that the general denial of the genuineness of the Pentateuch cannot be satisfactorily accounted for by the universal tendency of the age to historical skepticism, we must now endeavor to point out its true cause.

It lies in the tendency of the age to Naturalism—that system which seeks to explain all events by the common laws of nature—and this tendency has its root in the estrangement of the age from God. Because men have not had within themselves experimental proof of the existence of a living God, therefore they seek to eradicate all traces of him out of history. Because within themselves every thing goes on entirely according to fixed natural laws, therefore they think every thing without them must have happened in the same way.

This mode of thinking and reasoning has, by those who adopted it, been called by the dignified name of refinement (*Bildung*.)* But this certainly unjustly. Naturalism could be considered an advanced stage of refinement only on the ground that its modern advocates had discovered that what had before been held to be supernatural through ignorance of the laws of nature, can be fully accounted for by those laws. But as the modern extended knowledge of nature does not affect this matter at all, as that is still looked upon as supernatural which was before held to be so, it is only through gross insolence that the name of refinement can be arrogated. This pretension brings with it many absurdities. It must, in the first place, against all evidence, be maintained that the advocates of the *mythos*-theory, at the present time, are more cultivated than the defenders of the truth of the Bible. Then again, there is in the history of

* The word expresses the highest stage of advancement in every respect, especially in knowledge and taste.—Tr.

opposition to the Pentateuch a *partie honteuse*, which those on that side endeavor carefully to conceal, and of which one gets not a hint from histories like that of Hartmann. If the denial of the genuineness of the Pentateuch is to be eulogized as refinement, then they also must be considered refined, whom we have always hitherto been accustomed to regard as rude and uncultivated in the highest degree. Take, for example, the free-thinkers of Calvin's time, the *dogs*, *hogs*, and *fools*, as he constantly calls them, who in that day made sport of the Pentateuch.* Also the author of the *Catechisme de l'honnête-homme*,† who says, p. 10, "the events recorded in the Pentateuch astonish those who judge only by their reason, and in whom this blind reason has not been enlightened by special grace." This author, it seems, then possessed already that 'cultivated understanding,' which is, according to De Wette, *a priori* confident of the spuriousness of the Pentateuch, because it contains accounts of miracles and prophecies. Refinement is to be ascribed too to the vulgar *Edelmann*, who makes the Pentateuch to be nothing but "pieces thrown together, put into their present order by nobody knows who," but probably "the crafty rabbi, Ezra." (See his *Moses mit aufgedecktem Angesicht*, p. 9. u. a. Stellen.) Also to the two abandoned and half-crazy nuns in a cloister of Tuscany, who according to De Potter, *Vie de Scipio Ricci*, T. I. p. 115, Ed. II., declared on trial that they believed Moses and the authors of the other books of the Bible to be worthy of no more regard than for example Plutarch, or any other profane writer.‡ Singular fathers and mothers of refinement! harbingers of the rising sun of illumination!

* See for instance his Commentary on Gen. 6: 14 (on Noah's ark), "Hoc Porphyrius *vel quispiam alius canis*, fabulosum esse obganniet, quia non apparet ratio, vel quia est insolitum, vel quia repugnat communis ordo naturae. Ego regero contra, totam hanc Mosis narrationem, nisi miraculis referta esset, frigidam et jejunam, et ridiculam fore dico." On Gen. 49: 1, "Sed oblatrant quidam protervi canes: unde Mosi notitia sermonis in obscurio tugurio ante ducentos annos habiti."

† 'Catechism of the genteel man.' — "Les événements recontés dans le Pentateuque étonnent ceux qui ont le malheur de ne juger, que par leur raison et dans qui cette raison aveugle n'est pas éclairée par une grace particulière."

‡ "Que Moïse et les autres auteurs des livres qui composent la sainte bible, fussent plus dignes de considération, qu'un Plutarque par exemple, ou quelque autre écrivain profane."

That Naturalism is the real vital principle of the opposition made to the Pentateuch, appears plainly from the violent efforts made before the final step of denying the genuineness was taken,* in order to bring the Pentateuch to coincide with the reigning spirit of the times. Eichhorn, who shows what his ground is in regard to religion by the following few words: (Einleitung Th. 3. s. 176) "For us who have investigated the causes of things, the name of God is often, in such cases, *an expletive that may be dispensed with.*" Eichhorn labors, by explaining away everything that is supernatural, to set aside whatever presupposes the existence of a living personal God. That he and his contemporaries were ready to make the immense sacrifices which were necessary in order to carry through such a plan of interpretation, shows how strong the motive was which influenced them, and how entirely it accounts for the course afterwards taken, when it was no longer possible to conceal the defects and difficulties of this one. A few examples will show what sort of reverence for 'the hand in the clouds' was maintained while the genuineness of the Pentateuch was still admitted. Eichhorn thinks (Einleit. Th. 3. s. 303) that the destruction of Korah and his company creates no difficulty, if we will not mistake *the nature of symbolic language*. "Might not the writer, in order to represent very strongly the awfulness of the unusual punishment which was threatened, viz. *the burying them alive*, call it a swallowing up by the earth, a going down alive into the pit?" It is just as easy, according to him, to free the budding of Aaron's rod of its miraculous character. "If, when, by a new trial by lot with staves, Aaron obtained for himself and his family again the office of high-priest, his staff was twined with buds, leaves, and fruit, and thus carried through

* With what difficulty the determination was made to take this final step, and how strong therefore the proofs of the genuineness of the Pentateuch are, (even those that lie on the surface; for of such as lie deeper, men had then no conception,) is shown by a remark of Corrodi in his *Beleuchtung des Bibelcanons*, 1792, Bd. 1. s. 53: "At present, independent thinkers and lovers of truth regard it no longer as audacity to express their opinion freely as to the antiquity of the Pentateuch. Yet most friends of Bible study are inclined to think that it is still safer not to use so much freedom in regard to the Pentateuch as is taken with the other books of the Old Testament. I can also easily conceive that I shall be very unwelcome with my doubts of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch."

the camp as a sign that it had decided in his favor, and was then placed in the sanctuary for an eternal proof of the fact against any future denial, what is there improbable in all this?" The shining of Moses' face could, he thinks, be regarded miraculous only so long as the nature of electricity was unknown. Had Eichhorn been in the storm on mount Sinai, instead of Moses, he would on descending have shone in the same way, and that even down to his toes, if he had before stripped off his clothing. "As he came down from the mount at evening, and they who saw him perceived that his face shone (the rest of his body being covered by his clothes), and he and his contemporaries were not able to explain the phenomenon from physical causes, was it not natural for him to ascribe it to that, of the reality of which he felt assured, viz. his intercourse with the Deity," s. 280. The pillar of cloud and fire was, in his opinion, nothing more than the usual signal given in marching by the smoke of the caravan-fire, s. 298. In regard to the plagues of Egypt, "it has been proved that Moses brought about the deliverance of his people from Egypt by means of those natural evils to which that country is every year subject," s. 253. This proof he considers himself as having given in his essay *de Ægypti Anno Mirabili*, out of which we could quote many more rare things.* But what has been already adduced will suffice to show that an inducement which was strong enough to lead to such a total giving up of common sense, was also strong enough to lead to a rejection of the genuineness of the Pentateuch without and even against all evidence derived from the Pentateuch itself.

Yet the real design of these efforts was declared with perfect openness—an openness which proceeded from confidence in the omnipotence of the spirit of the age. And not till afterwards, when the universal reign of that spirit had ceased, and men began to feel that mere presupposition or assertion was not proof, did this design begin again to be concealed and the pretence made that only historico-critical reasons were regarded, aside from all doctrinal presupposition, and that without any bias whatever and even against inclination, the genuineness of the Pentateuch must be given up. Lately, however, that spirit has again obtained more power and is conscious of that power, and

* Rosenmüller has considered this essay of sufficient importance to have its substance embodied in his Commentary.—Tr.

with the help of the pantheistic tendencies of the times, has succeeded in becoming the universal public sentiment. And as public sentiment always claims infallibility, and needs take no notice of the impotent opposition of those who have fallen behind the age, the mask has begun again to be thrown off.

A few quotations must be made in proof of what has been just said. Corrodi, who as we have seen (p. 460 note), was among the first of those who denied the genuineness of the Pentateuch, says, l. c. p. 59, 60, after enumerating the miracles it relates: "Are not these manifest signs of a later writer who was not an eye-witness of the events he records?" The only reason which he gives is the miraculous accounts. He was satisfied therefore in asserting that the *historical* parts were of later origin; he still allows the *laws* to have been from Moses. Staüdlin, in his *Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu* (History of the moral doctrines of Jesus Christ) Bd. I. s. 118, remarks, "However it may be in regard to the *historical parts* of the Pentateuch, which indeed are liable to suspicion on account of their high miraculous coloring, and in many passages are of such a character that they must either have been written long after Moses, or have been greatly interpolated, yet there are strong reasons for believing that *the laws* were made, written and collected into one code by Moses himself." As Diderot on his death-bed declared that the first step in philosophy was unbelief,* so the reviewer of *Fritsche's Vertheidigung der Aechtheit des Pentateuchs* (Defence of the genuineness of the Pentateuch) in Ammon's and Bertholdt's Journal Th. 4. s. 389, makes unbelief to be the foundation of criticism. What cannot be accounted for from natural causes must fall. He says: "When the author remarks upon Gen. xlix. 'I hold that Jacob could have foreseen all this, as he was enlightened by a higher light,' he stands no longer on the ground of the critic who seeks to explain the causes of events, but on that of the theologian, who cuts the knot." Bertholdt in the section on the spirit of the Hebrew Historiography (Einl. Th. 3. s. 745 ss.) has the following words, which might well have been prefixed as a motto to the whole: "The world is confessedly a mirror and as a man looks into a mirror, just so he also looks out of it."†

* "Le premier pas vers la philosophie c'est l'incrédulité." Mémoires, corresp. etc. de Diderot, t. I. Par. 1830. p. 56.

† "Die Welt ist bekanntlich ein Spiegel, und so wie man in einen Spiegel hineinschaut, grade so schaut man aus demselben wieder

By this section he has made the whole subsequent historico-critical investigation on the Pentateuch really superfluous. It is an *opus supererogationis*, apparently undertaken for the sake of the weak. The sum of this section is this: every thing (in the Pentateuch) that presupposes the existence of a living God is poetic fiction. "Every historical narrative," he remarks, "which partakes of the supernatural, we call mythology; those narratives especially have a mythical character in which the divine agency is made to affect immediately the course of events, as in miracles and revelations." He also without disguise declares unbelief to be the foundation of criticism. Moses must be denied at once a degree of knowledge which exceeded the natural means of his age to attain. Since a transcending of the natural limits is *impossible*, it is certain *a priori* and without examination of the details that he never had such knowledge. Compare s. 773: "The common opinion that all those passages in the Pentateuch which speak of events which did not happen till after the time of Moses are predictions, certainly deserve the praise of being well-meant; but criticism must not suffer itself to be bribed by anything—it must have no other object than to find out and bring to light historical truth."—De Wette; whose words, 'and the reality is often very different from what we have imagined,' (Beytr. 2. p. 10.) contain his own condemnation,* speaks just as unreservedly. In the 'Axioms' which are placed at the commencement of his *Kritik d. Israelitisch. Geschichte* (Critical Examination of the Jewish History) p. 15, he says: A narrator who relates things as realities which in the natural course of events are entirely impossible and inconceivable, and contradict both experience and the laws of nature, who gives out such things as history, and places them in the series of historical facts; such a one

heraus." As in looking at our own image in a mirror we ourselves are the source and cause of what we see, so our ideas and understanding of objects and events in the world are affected, nay created, by our previously formed opinions. The Hebrew historians *believed* that God did often interpose supernaturally in the affairs and events of this world, and the consequence was that they had many cases of such interposition to relate.—Almost Berkeley's theory—that external things have only an ideal existence.—Tr.

* He gives another self-condemning sentence on p. 239: "In history as well as in life, we must expect the best of every one until the contrary is proved."

although his intention may be to relate history, is not a narrator of history but of poetic fiction.* And such a narrator deserves no sort of credit in any thing. For though other facts related by him appear natural and probable, yet, in such company, they are not to be considered such. They are things out of another world, and may have been invented as well as the miraculous ones." The Israelitish history could not, it is true, pass the ordeal of a criticism based on such axioms as these; but it is hard to see what criticism has to do if such axioms are established. The easy mockery of Voltaire would be more in place than laborious and dull criticism. In the first three editions of this author's *Einleit. ins A. T.* (Introduction to the Old Testament,) at the outset of the investigation on the Pentateuch, § 145, we find this passage: "It is in this way also that so many occurrences contradict the laws of nature and suppose an immediate interposition of God. If it is to the cultivated understanding a *settled matter* (*entscheiden*) that such miracles did not really happen, the question occurs whether they so appeared to the eye-witnesses and participators; but this must also be denied; and thus we come to the conclusion that these accounts were not contemporaneous and were not derived from contemporaneous sources." Thus the spuriousness of the Pentateuch is established before any investigation, and is to be maintained although the strongest proofs might be urged against it. In the 4th edition we find these words slightly yet very essentially changed. It is there said, "If it is for the cultivated understanding *at least doubtful* (*wenigstens zweifelhaft*) whether such miracles did really happen." We have here an example of the before-mentioned accommodation to the spirit of the times. Another is afforded us by *Hartmann* who s. 358, considers not the miracles *as such*, but the frequent mixing in of unnecessary miracles for the

* Here also it can be shown by examples how even those historians who come nearest to this perverted theology, fall short of the merit (or demerit, as you please,) of fully imbibing its spirit. Von Rotteck (see vol. XI, p. 446) remarks (l. c. p. 24): "An impossible fact, i. e. such a one as contradicts itself, or some other fact, or the laws of nature, can never obtain rational belief. . . . I speak here not of proper miracles, i. e. things that are referred to as such—for the very notion of a miracle supposes a departure from the laws of nature. Yet he who admits in general the possibility of miracles, will yet require stronger proof for their authentication than in the case of natural facts."

accomplishing of unimportant objects, as proof of the mythical character of the Pentateuch ; although upon his ground, even the spare mixing in of appropriate miracles for important objects would be sufficient proof of the same mythical character of the Pentateuch. In a new edition of De Wette's *Einleitung* we may expect to see the third step taken, a return to openness ; for, as we see from the preface to his *Commentary on Matthew*, his confidence in the continued advance of general cultivation, and his contempt for those who in the last turn of things see only a temporary change of the spirit of the age, have in the mean time, most astonishingly increased. But we need not wait for De Wette—his representative, *von Bohlen* has already taken this third step. Or is it still not quite with the old open heartedness that the latter remarks, (*Gen. Einl. s. 36.*) “ Criticism as such is always unbelieving ;” and with which *Vatke* says, *s. 9*, “ Very many and sometimes the principal grounds on which books purporting to be of a greater antiquity are referred to a later age, are of a doctrinal character.” That even greater weight is now attached to these doctrinal grounds than formerly, appears from the fact that the most fundamental defences of the genuineness of the Pentateuch are now passed over—are not read, much less refuted. Thus, of the three latest opposers of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, not one has read the fundamental book of Ranke.*

But in the carrying out of the principle that only what is within the sphere of natural agencies can be admitted to be historically true, or be related by an eye-witness, a difference is observable. At first the principle was applied to that only which most manifestly transcended those agencies, viz. miracles and prophecies. De Wette, however, soon saw that there was no stopping at these, that the application of the principle to the Pentateuch, must have a far wider sweep. Thus, he makes it proof against the truth of the history of the flood, that Noah could not have foreseen at all that the flood would come—as proof of the mythical character of Abraham's history, that it is inconceivable how he could cherish the hope of being the progenitor of a nation while his wife was barren—and just as inconceivable that he should hope his descendants would become possessors of the land of Canaan : “ For how could such an idea have occurred to him ?” (*Beitr. I. s. 63.*) That none

* *Untersuchungen ueber den Pentateuch.* Erlangen 1834.—Tr.

of the passages which speak of future evil to Israel came from Moses, is to him certain—"For Moses could not have entertained such gloomy anticipations in regard to the future fortunes of his people." This kind of argumentation is in some degree restrained within the old limits—inasmuch as it is only a bold extension of the sentence long before pronounced against the predictions of the Pentateuch. But the remark, (s. 62) 'could Abraham have been capable of such a religiousness as is ascribed to him in Genesis?' (comp. s. 114), manifestly goes clear beyond those limits, and opens the way to an entirely new class of doctrinal arguments against the genuineness of the Pentateuch. Nature is here regarded as much more fixed and inflexible than had been usual—God more entirely and exclusively confined to heaven, and the possibility not only of a direct and manifest interposition, but also of a more silent and internal influence in the world and in man denied him. The piety of Abraham cannot be explained by the laws of natural development—consequently it did not exist.

Still, as long as men held fast to theism, the matter could not go beyond such single scattered remarks; a consistent carrying through of the principle was not to be expected. On the theistic ground even the denial of miracles and prophecies must bear the charge of an interested origin and the reproach of a guilty conscience—by no turnings or windings can a single argument be advanced against the possibility of miracles and prophecies. If God *is*, he can also *act*. If nature was created by him, it must also be unconditionally subject to him, and can offer no opposition to his agency upon it. How then can men deny the possibility even of God's secret and internal agency upon nature, without also rejecting all belief in a Providence, and so pass over from Theism to Atheism or Pantheism. For, if Providence is not an empty name, a mistaken appellation of nature itself given to it by ignorance, what can it be but that silent and mysterious influence of God upon natural causes?

But this difficulty is of late more and more put out of the way. *The Theism of those who do not recognize God in Christ, is beginning to give place to Pantheism*: or rather, Pantheism, which had only put on the garb of Theism, is beginning to throw its covering aside. It is becoming more and more acquainted with its own real character, and is purifying itself of its former foreign admixtures, and shaking off the pietistic awkwardnesses which before cleaved to it. Now, the carrying through

of the principle goes on finely—It is all over with miracles and prophecies—for who could have performed and given them? The truth ‘our God is in the heaven; he hath done whatsoever he pleased,’ is a syllogism, the *major* of which is with wicked joy negatived. And just so is every thing else rejected that is beyond the operation of the fixed causes of natural development. To bring any such thing to pass, God, who was yet in embryo, must have anticipated his own coming into being, which is inconceivable.

This advance in estrangement from God, and so in consistency, has its representative in the book of *Vatke*.^{*} When he says, s. 185, “In the positive results of the criticism of the oldest Hebrew traditions, here given, we have gone a step further than the common critical view, and we assert that *a consistent carrying through of critical principles makes that further step necessary*,” we certainly coincide entirely with him, provided, that by critical principles be understood those adopted in the interest of unbelief. But it is a question whether these are not rather to be entirely given up; the author has not proved the contrary. With genuine impartiality, he assumes his pantheistic ground to be correct, and then, trying the Pentateuch by the principles of the natural formation and development of the doctrines and system of religion, which he had laid down in his introduction, he makes that to be proof of the spuriousness, which the older theology regarded as proof of the divine origin of the Mosaic religion. After all this however, the difficulty remained that even if we transfer to the end of the Jewish history that which occurs at the beginning, still we find nothing like it among any other people at any stage of their religious cultivation. No nation ever attained by reason only, and in the course of the natural development of their religious ideas, to such a system of religion and morals. The author seeks to remove this difficulty by making the difference between the religion of the Hebrews and heathenism as little as possible—and this is the easier for him as he makes his own religious views and principles the standard of comparison. Thus for example he says (s. 103), “If we compare the moral character of the Hebrews and of the Greeks, we shall find the great difference which their religious views exhibit greatly diminished. *Not seldom even the superiority is on the side of the Greeks*, as is shown by their civil in-

^{*} See Vol. XI, p. 439, note.

stitutions, in which the whole moral life of a people is concentrated." Let us show by a few quotations how the whole criticism of the author is filled with doctrinal assumptions, and thus can have weight only with such as stand on the same ground as to religion and philosophy with himself; and how he carries his principles through with inflexible consistency. The supposition of an original (primitive) revelation such as the Pentateuch supports, and even noble heathen as, e. g. Plato acknowledged, is rejected with these words: (s. 102.) "It is based on an extremely shallow conception of divine revelation, contradicts the true notion of religion, and the relation which exists between religion and man's moral sense, which attains to that which is perfect only after a long series of intermediate steps."—"Perfection is found only at the end of the process of development"—this proposition which is necessary upon pantheistic principles, but absurd on all other, is used here to overthrow the fact of a primitive revelation, and by Strauss to disprove the reality of the person of Christ as portrayed in the Gospels. The doctrine of a primitive revelation 'is based on an extremely shallow conception of revelation,' because it makes a separation between him who reveals and him to whom the revelation is made; whereas, according to the new light which the philosophy of our day has received, these two are one and the same. The traditions about the religion of the Patriarchs are worthy of no credit;—for if we concede to them the least historical worth, we break in upon the space to be allowed for that long series of developments which religion had to pass through, before it could attain that height on which, even after we have taken away a multitude of genuine elements, and added a multitude of spurious ones, we see it standing in the Mosaic age. See s. 184. Uncritical tradition has ascribed to Moses many religious views and truths which the Israelitish mind did not produce for a long series of later ages. If we do not adopt this view of the matter, we forsake the ground of natural causes and development, and so give up ourselves. For on the pantheistic ground it is "impossible that a whole people should sink suddenly and at once from a higher to a lower degree of religious culture; *and it is just as impossible that an individual should rise suddenly from a lower to a higher degree, and carry along with him in his sudden rise a whole people.* Single individuals indeed we must admit to have had a higher form and degree of self-knowledge; but we

must not make even these entirely independent of the common degree of attainment around them, by supposing them favored with divine revelation.* We must therefore either suppose intermediate steps and periods of development concerning which tradition is silent, or where this is for other reasons inadmissible, lower our estimate of the characters and attainments of such individuals to the standard of their times. This we must do particularly in the case of Moses—*since on the supposition that the accounts we have of what he did, be even in the main true, both he himself and the whole course of the Hebrew history are phenomena utterly inexplicable.*" He must have appeared earlier than that point in the process of development at which such a phenomenon could be produced, and was therefore a greater miracle than Christ himself, (s. 181—183.)—The decalogue, as it now is, cannot have been given by Moses—for the prohibition of image worship must have originated in an age when the notion of the abstract ideality of God had been distinctly formed. But this notion is based on an abstraction infinitely more profound than is commonly supposed, and has no resemblance at all to other systems of religion which excluded images. We cannot give the Mosaic age the credit of a giant-step in religious truth such as this is," (s. 233 ff.) The *tenth* commandment is also to be denied to Moses. "For that all guilty *desire* of what belongs to others should be forbidden appears to us improbable," (s. 239.) The place which one of these commandments now occupies, probably contained originally a prohibition *against*

* Hengstenberg adds here in a parenthesis, "Solcher (offenbarungen) nämlich, die von dem *werdenden Gottes* ausgehen; richtiger und *ehrlicher*: einer religiösen Genialität." The design of the parenthesis is to remark upon the sense in which a Hegelian pantheist can use the term 'divine revelations:': "such revelations, namely, says Hengstenberg, as come from the God in embryo (in process of development;) [the author might have said] more correctly and *more honestly*, [by supposing them favored with] a *religious geniality*." This last word is to be explained by that rendered in the text 'self-knowledge,' viz. *selbstbewusstseyn*. Both words derive all their meaning and application to the present subject from the pantheistic theory that God himself and religious truth are *the development* of the human mind in a specific direction. The rapidity and the degree of this development (or progress in self-knowledge) in particular cases, will be according to the *geniality* or *aptitude* of the soul for religious improvement. See on p. 468 the sentence "As according to Strauss," etc.—Tr.

feeding on raw flesh! (s. 240.) The command 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,' belongs probably to an age preceding the exile, but was certainly not given till many centuries after Moses. "For many intermediate steps were necessary before that great principle could have been expressed in such simplicity and universality," (s. 425.) It is easy to see that he who carries so far as this the principle of natural development, has no need to urge the matter of miracles and prophecies as was formerly done by opposers of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. A public which can be expected to be so well-disposed for such doctrines, as to be ready to enter into these subtleties as soon as they are pointed out by the author, needs not to be referred to those obvious things which lie upon the surface. (And the author has throughout reckoned upon well-disposed readers—he has done nothing to convince those who were ill-disposed. The cause of the opposition to the Pentateuch has, on the field of historical criticism, gained nothing by his work.) This silence on the subject of miracles and prophecies is very significant. It shows how far the author and his party are from thinking them possible. It is not worth while any more to spend a word upon them. The belief in miracles is based on a view of the world "long since exploded."* If moreover this principle is carried out to such an extreme as is done in the last two instances, then all revelation even in the sense of the author, all religious geniality is done away. Unbelief is here manifestly become pedantic.

The passages of the Pentateuch which speak of false gods as having no real existence must be taken out as of a later date. "For the question as to the existence of the heathen gods belongs to the later reflexion," (s. 232.) Just so the reconciling and uniting of the principle of limitation (in the system of the Jews) and that of universality, as appears in the annunciation of blessing upon all nations through Abraham's seed, belongs to a later age. The question, how the universality of the divine essence could comport with his being the peculiar national God of a small people, could not have occurred to Moses. The

* Those who think they set aside everything that does not coincide with their own narrow views, with the remark, 'it is a doctrine now exploded'—'it is obsolete'—'it does not belong to the new course of development'—a mode of arguing that is getting more and more fashionable—ought to have the scourge of keen satire shaken over their heads.

local unity of religious worship, the existence of an organized priesthood, with a system of revenue, and the complicated ritual, cannot be accounted for from the circumstances of the people at that time ; “ *these must, if they were really established in the Mosaic age, have had a higher origin, and a prophetic character, which however could be said at most only of the fundamental idea on which they are based,*” (s. 216.) If there are passages which definitely teach the universal sinfulness of man, they are to be cancelled as spurious—for the consciousness of a universal sinfulness of man could at that time have existed only in the germ ; because the objective principles of justice and morality (*des Rechtlichen und Sittlichen*) must be discovered and fully formed, long before the subjective principles which constitute conscience can be developed and put in operation. And in the same manner, the objective notion of the divine holiness, is the basis of the later formed subjective notion of internal purity,” (s. 236.)—As, according to *Strauss*, the Christ of the New Testament is a production of the religious mind of the christian church, so according to *Vatke*, Moses is a production of that of the Jewish church, a production, on the conception and formation of which a long series of ages has labored. He gives this opinion the credit of ascribing greater merit to the prophets, (s. 481.) The view hitherto entertained, that the prophetic system grew out of the law, he overthrows at a blow ; it is opposed to the natural course of development. To make the best modification—the perfected form of the external and the objective (i. e. the law as it exists in the Pentateuch,) the commencing point of the divine administration of the theocratic state, would be to disregard the relation of mediate and immediate, of revelation and reflexion, of internal and external objectivity,” (s. 227.)* By all these operations, the author thus at length at the end of his investigations, arrives at the result which, at the beginning and before any investigation, he had expressed as fixed and settled : “ Taking them all together, we come to the result that what Moses accomplished was not itself a perfect whole, but was only the starting point of a higher development. The differ-

* The translator is not responsible for the obscurity of *the ideas* of his author. This sentiment will, however, be intelligible to those who have paid attention to the *development-theory*, in the terms of which this sentiment is expressed. See *infra*.—T_a.

ing religious elements floating in the popular mind were not as yet reconciled and united, even in the religious system and opinions of Moses himself; and consequently the conflict between them must have continued; and it was only gradually that the ideal principle of the system as we now see it in the Pentateuch could pervade and modify the mass of views, the rites and the moral life of the people, and form them all into a consistent whole." It is worthy of notice that the author has unhesitatingly and unsparingly applied to the Pentateuch the standard of his own knowledge both of God and of sin;—and has thus remained true to that great principle of '*subjectivity*,' which is indeed (s. 6) the grand principle of the new development, and which gives its own peculiar impress to all the new mental life which has been waked up, in religion as well as in morals, politics, etc. This principle is, to admit that only to be true and valid which is supported by our own convictions—which is only a dignified circumlocution of the proverb, "What the rustic is not acquainted with, he dislikes."* What our own experience teaches us is here confirmed, viz. that sin is no less a mystery than grace; and that only that spirit 'that searches the deep things of God' can clear up the obscurity that covers the depths of man. "Such a form of unbelief, the author remarks, (s. 187), as the Pentateuch supposes in the Mosaic age, is inconceivable. The sin of the people could not have been in the will only; there must have been a want of knowledge. That the people were led into error by sensual enjoyments is inconceivable. Had Moses been able to teach them the truth, they would have acted in conformity to it, and they would have abstained from all idolatry."—Such reasonings as these are sufficiently refuted by our daily experience; but the devotees of the great principle of *subjectivity*, have no eye or ear for experience, for they acknowledge nothing to be true and valid but their own convictions. Accordingly, on s. 181 a sentiment is advanced in utter contradiction with history, but which is, to be sure, the only consolation for the devotees of the God in embryo, (*des werdenden Gottes*) viz. that it is impossible for a whole people to sink from a higher to a lower grade of religious

* "Was der Bauer nicht kennt, das mag er nicht." This same principle it is which Jacobi describes as the heaven-storming Titan spirit of the age, which differs from that of the giants and the holders to fist-justice only that it substitutes intellectual strength for bodily. Comp. Reinhold's Briefwechsel. s. 224.

improvement. And on s. 197, in applying this proposition, the author asserts that the idolatries of Israel after the Mosaic times cannot be accounted for simply from the disposition of the people to what was external and addressed to the senses, nor from the seductive neighborhood of idolatry ; but that they show that not only as regards the people, but in the case of the lawgiver himself, between whom and his contemporaries we are not to suppose too great a difference, the religion of Jehovah had at that time many a heathenish coloring and admixture.

The historian will smile at such assertions as these,—the thought will immediately occur to him, that upon such principles the first thing the historical truth of which ought to be given up would be the French revolution with all its horrors. For how little that event can be accounted for on the principles of Pelagianism [Panthéism] is sufficiently proved by the agonizing *non putaram* of so many noble characters of the time who had at first hailed the revolution with acclamation. But the theologian lets nothing lead him astray. Our author also was not the first one to apply this principle—he has only carried it through more consistently. Even *Reimarus** says, in accordance with the same principle, (*Uebrigé noch ungedruckte Fragmente des Wolfenb. Fragmentist., herausg. von Schmidt. 1787,*) s. 127, “I ask any one, if he had a brother who did all such things by miracle—at whose word, for instance, fire fell from heaven—who could impart of his own prophetic spirit to seventy others—who could command the winds, etc.—would he after all this, and especially just when his brother had performed something of the kind, have had the heart and the baseness to attempt any thing against him?” He does not at all conceive that he himself has such a brother, who is infinitely higher than Moses, and that by his own example he makes superfluous all further answer to his question. Just so he says, p. 56, it is inconceivable that Pharaoh should have hardened his heart so often—an argument which *von Bohlen* has lately brought up again, who thinks (p. 58) that such a weak-headed king as the Egyptian Pharaoh could exist only in popular tales. De Wette, reasoning from the same principles, finds in the proneness of the people in after-

* Reimarus, Professor in the Gymnasium at Hamburg, born in 1694, author of ‘the Wolfenbüttel Fragments’ (*Wolfenbüttelsche Fragmente*). These Fragments were the first open and bold attack of the modern rationalism upon the inspiration of the Bible, and produced a great shock in Germany. See p. 475, note.—Tr.

times to the worship of idols, a testimony against the Mosaic origin of the ceremonial law. "Why," he remarks, (Beytr. Th. 1. s. 257) "did the people continually incline after strange gods? If their own religious worship had satisfied their desire for a worship addressed to the senses, they certainly would not have forsaken it. But such a pomp of ceremonial and of priests as is established in the Mosaic books, must have sufficiently gratified the senses." The least acute observation of human nature—for which, however, self-knowledge is an indispensable foundation—would have shown him that besides the taste for what was addressed to the senses, which the Mosaic law gratified, there is another in men, which that law did not gratify, (namely, for what is sinful,)—besides the taste for sensible rites, to which God condescends, another which degrades him. Is marriage always an infallible preventative of whoredom? But to one destitute of the knowledge of human nature, that which is most natural appears unnatural, and therefore unhistorical, and so proof of the spuriousness of the book which records it.

We have thus far shown how the denial of the genuineness of the Pentateuch was produced by an aversion for everything supernatural and unnatural. But the hostility felt and manifested against this book has still other grounds. Among these is especially prominent *the fashionable doctrine as to sin and holiness*.—"As the man, so is his God," said Goethe (West-östl. Divan, Werke Stuttgart, 1827, s. 185.) To an age which regards sin "as a necessary ingredient in human nature, as only unformed and imperfect good, as a necessary condition to the existence of virtue," to such an age the holiness and justice of God must of course be an abomination. It must seek at any expense to rid itself of a history in which these divine attributes are so very prominent. Jehovah, the high and the holy, who visits the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation, is now regarded as the irascible God of the Jews—and this Jehovah is yet the God of heaven and of earth, the enemy and judge of sin even of the present generation, as long as the Pentateuch is genuine, and what it contains is true history. For it is not only *taught* in the Pentateuch that God is holy and just—against which it might be sufficient to say that the doctrine is too refined for that rude age—but the *doctrine* has a foundation in the *history*. God's holiness and justice reveal themselves in a series of events; and must therefore be real, if these events be historically true. What great influence

this cause has had in an age governed by the great principle of subjectivity, is strikingly shown in the example of *Goethe*. What principally led him to represent Moses as the Robespierre of the old world is shown by himself, p. 160, when he complains of ‘*the disagreeableness of the matter*’ of the Pentateuch. The thought that God sent out his destroying angel over Egypt shocks him. It was the Israelites, according to him, who at the instigation of Moses undertook this anticipation of the Sicilian Vespers. “Even the pretended ‘judgments of God’ among the Israelites were executed by a band of Sicarii led on by Moses. Aaron and Moses were not excluded from the promised land by the justice of God, but Aaron was secretly put out of the way by Moses, and Moses by Joshua and Caleb, who thought it well to bring to an end the regency of a narrow-gifted man which they had borne for some years, and to send him after the many unfortunates he had slaughtered.” On this plan of understanding the book, its matter remains still ‘disagreeable;’ but it is no longer of a kind to disturb our own repose. History is no longer prophecy. Moses, that gloomy and reserved man, who endeavored to supply his natural want of a talent for governing by daring barbarity, is now long dead, and his God, who was only the reflected image of himself, is gone to the grave with him.

The denial of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, was besides aided in its origin by *dislike to its principal personages*. So long as the genuineness is allowed, that near connection with God which the Pentateuch ascribes to them must also be admitted to have been real. For this connection was not one in idea only, but showed itself in facts which cannot be denied if the genuineness be admitted. But, for such a connection with God, the critics judged these men not at all fit. They could not understand the essential traits of their character, because like can be appreciated only by its like—they overlooked the *faith* of these heroes of faith, who by it obtained a good report, and maliciously magnified their human weaknesses, great enough in themselves, and which in other cases are treated as incidental. It was on this ground that the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist in imitation of the English deists attacked the genuineness of the Pentateuch, and the credibility of its history.* He concludes

* What Hartmann asserts (l. c. p. 22) is incorrect, viz, that the Fragmentist did not deny the genuineness of the Pentateuch, but only branded Moses as a shameful impostor. Even in the first printed

his critique on the Patriarchs, s. 37, with these words: "Behold a long series of men of one race, who seek to gain themselves wealth in their wanderings by lies, deceit, and shameful traffick, by cruelty and oppression, by robbery and murder. . . . I hold it to be a manifest contradiction that God should have had intercourse with such impure souls, and that he should have preferred above others, and chosen for himself such a hateful and wicked race."—And that even De Wette stands essentially on the same ground of judgment, appears from expressions like the following (Krit. s. 123) "Finally, it is very characteristic that the Hebrews did not dislike such means, and that they even made their Jacob *the model of deceit*. The Greeks had also their Ulysses—but how much more noble and exalted a character than this Jacob."

To all these causes must be added *the incapacity of understanding the spirit of the Pentateuch*, as also of the Bible histories in general. In consequence of this incapacity, nothing but disorder, chance, and contradiction was discovered, where the enlightened eye sees order, adaptation and harmony. This incapacity is shown most strikingly in the investigations on the plan and structure of the Pentateuch. The fragmentary character of this book—the inevitable consequence of which is its spuriousness—was regarded as placed beyond all doubt.—"In regard to the Pentateuch," says De Wette, s. 21, "after so many acute and profound investigations as have lately been made—we may regard it as a point settled and acknowledged, that the books of Moses are a collection of single compositions, originally independent of each other, and from different authors." Phenomena, which like the change in the use of the divine names, when correctly understood, unanswerably prove the unity of the whole, are perverted to proofs of the very opposite by those who occupy the ground of narrow-minded subjectivity, which is capable of understanding nothing beyond itself. This same incapacity had influence also in many other cases. It was nothing but this that led men to make the great chasms existing in the history between Genesis and Exodus, and in the account of the wandering in the desert, proofs against the Mosaic authorship of the book—for as soon as we admit that the author de-

Fragment, on the passage through the Red Sea, the spuriousness of the Pentateuch is asserted as decidedly as possible. Vide *Fragmente und Anti-fragmente*, Nürnberg. 1778, s. 77, 78.

signed to write *sacred* history, the history of the chosen race, these chasms appear to be a necessary consequence of his plan. From this same cause completeness of detail in the history is demanded, and where this is not found complaint is made of its looseness, betraying the non-contemporaneous author, of its mythical character, and of its contradictions; as soon however as we measure the work by its own standard, it appears perfectly natural that the history should as far as possible select only the essential events. De Wette had some idea of this truth when he says, s. 68, "The historian did not design such a history of Abraham as would suit our modern students of history; he wrote a religious history for the religious." But De Wette let this thought have no further influence. From this incapacity finally, a multitude of crude religious ideas were invented and ascribed to the author of the Pentateuch, which if they really existed, must overthrow its claims to a Mosaic authorship.

Now if we look at all these causes together, the doctrinal prejudices and the incapacities, and reflect that as long as men were under the dominion of the prevailing spirit of the age, from which only the Spirit of God can make free, they were sold under the power of all of them, it will no longer be an inexplicable thing that the genuineness of the Pentateuch has been so extensively denied. In addition to this, we must recollect that the same pseudo-criticism which was *a priori* confident of the spuriousness of the Pentateuch, *produced also a perfect stagnation of inquiry*, of exegetical, no less than historico-critical. The superficialness of the Commentary of *Vater* is now universally acknowledged. Since him, no independent exegetical work on the whole Pentateuch has appeared—for performances like that of *von Bohlen* on Genesis, will not be brought forward against this remark by those qualified to judge. The worth of the historico-critical labors of the age upon the Pentateuch, will in time be estimated by such assertions as, that before the captivity, no prophet quotes a passage from that book—a remark, which better suits the levity of the author of the *diction. philosoph. portal.* (*Voltaire*), who makes the same p. 275, than a German gelehrte.* No one of the opposers of the genuineness

* Let no man, in order to judge of the thoroughness of the historico-critical researches of late days, refer to the mass of apparent contradictions which they have brought to light, the traces of a later age, and other things incompatible with the genuineness of the books, which they have carefully noted. In an Appendix to *Voltaire's Life*

of the Pentateuch, has as yet taken the pains to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the results of the late researches on Egypt. No one of them has thought it worth while to examine the assertion of those engaged in these researches, that these results are universally favorable to the credit of the Pentateuch. If besides the prejudices and incapacabilities, we consider also this omission of all thorough research, it will not surprise us to hear from young men who are just commencing their literary career, decisions like the following: "Nothing but doctrinal considerations can any longer be advanced against the results of the investigations of Vater, and De Wette," (*George, die Judischen Feste*, s. 6.) Against such decisions, an appeal *a male informato* would be most in place.

We will now attempt to exhibit the various views which prevail in our day in reference to the Pentateuch; and first,

by Condorcet, (Berlin, 1791,) is found the following anecdote. — A Swedish traveller, who was looking through Voltaire's library, found there Calmet's Commentary on the Bible, having in it loose papers, on which all the difficulties noticed by Calmet were noted down, without a word of the solutions which Calmet had given them. This, said the Swede, who was besides a great admirer of Voltaire, is not honest. Our modern critics have gone to work in exactly the same way. *The author pledges himself to prove that every single objection to the Pentateuch, which has any appearance of plausibility, was long since the subject of the zealous investigations of the older theologians.* One has indeed no idea of this, if he does not extend his studies beyond Vater and De Wette. The modern criticism has nothing at all of its own except objections like that of De Wette, (l. c. p. 64,) "For the operation of circumcision some degree of surgical skill was necessary: who in Abraham's camp had any such skill? Besides, the operation is very painful; and how could Abraham expect all his people to undergo it? Could it have been of any importance to him whether his shepherds were circumcised or uncircumcised?" Our age has indeed been fruitful enough in arguments like these; but who does not see that to make them, neither knowledge, nor industry, nor thorough study, are necessary. How such arguments, which may be discovered indeed without a man's being exactly awake, are treated in the field of profane history, is shown in the case of P. F. G. Müller's book, '*Meine Ansicht der Geschichte* (My Views on History), Düsseldorf. 1814. With what a hearty laugh would the historian be received who should bring forward De Wette's arguments against circumcision by Abraham, as disproving the existence of circumcision among the Egyptians!

as to its Mosaic origin ; secondly, as to the historic character of its narratives.

As to the Mosaic origin there are *three* principal views :

1. The party *denies the Mosaic origin altogether*, or except in regard to a few very small portions. At the head of the party stands *De Wette*, who, after making some retractions in the last edition of his *Einleitung* (Introduction) § 149, admits only that the poetic fragments in Num. XXI, are certainly from Moses, that among the laws many may be ancient and genuine, though these cannot now be distinguished, and that the decalogue in its present shape cannot be from Moses, since we have it in a two-fold form. With *De Wette*, agree *Hartmann, von Bohlen* and *Vatke*. This last writer even rejects the genuineness of the pieces in Num. XXI, which *De Wette* had admitted. Whether *Gesenius* is to be reckoned to this party, or to which one he belongs, is uncertain. To judge by a remark made in the 10th edition of his *Smaller Grammar*, 1831, preface : “ it is yet matter of controversy whether the Pentateuch was wholly or partially written by Moses,” he seems now to repent of the positiveness with which he supported the results of *Vater* and *De Wette* (in his *Geschichte d. Heb. Sprache u. Schrift*—(History of the Heb. language and writing.) If only the fatal miracles and prophecies, and the choleric Jewish God were out of the way ! Then one might yield himself freely to the impressions he receives as an historian and philologist. How strong these impressions in favor of the genuineness of the Pentateuch must be, appears from the fact that they could not be effaced by doctrinal assumptions of which the author, standing where he does, could not divest himself. The admission just quoted does his open heartedness all honor.

2. Others maintain the Mosaic origin of *very considerable and important portions of the Pentateuch*. At the head of these is *Eichhorn*, who in the first edition of his *Einleitung*, maintained the genuineness of the whole, with the exception of a few interpolations : but in his last edition, modified his view, so as to maintain that the Pentateuch consists principally of pieces written partly by Moses and partly by some of his contemporaries, and that these were made up into one whole, with many additions, by a later compiler, probably between the times of Joshua and Samuel (s. 334.) The reason of this change in his opinions was (see s. XXXVII.) that he despaired of getting over the many difficulties which the Pentateuch

offered to his doctrinal opinions, by mere explanations. He expresses this despair with the greatest openness (s. 255); where he says in reference to the accounts of the Egyptian plagues: "If Moses the agent had himself written these accounts, the shape in which we now have them would indeed be a riddle." Thus the denial of the genuineness goes, as a general rule, only so far as doctrinal opinions come into play.—*Staüdlin* also belongs here—who, without wishing to decide upon the *historical parts*, which, as he then stood, must have been as repulsive in a doctrinal point of view, as they were attractive in a historical, maintained with great zeal the Mosaic origin of *the laws*. This he did, first, in his two *Commentationes de legum Mosaicarum momento et ingenio, collectione et effectibus*, Gött. 1796, 1797, afterwards in his *Geschichte d. Sittenlehre Jesu*, Bd. 1. s. 118 ff. and finally in the treatise, *Die Aechtheit d. Mosaischen Gesetze vertheidgt.* (The genuineness of the laws of Moses defended,) in *Ammon's und Bertholdt's Journal*, Th. 3. s. 225 ff. s. 337 ff. and Th. 4. s. 1 ff. s. 113 ff. where he (s. 113 ff.) declares the discourses in Deuteronomy to be genuine. The candid man clearly saw that the hostility to the Pentateuch was based upon very different ground than that of historico-critical argument. He remarks, Th. 3. s. 281, "The hatred of the Bible cherished by many of our day has undeniably prevailed extensively in the criticism of the Bible." He has set a good example by making a beginning at applying the results of the late investigations on ancient Egypt to the question of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. He has indeed only made a beginning; for he did not go to the original sources, but only made a careful use of what he found in *Heeren's Ideen*. The last treatise above referred to is especially useful. That he lacked a deep and adequate understanding of the Pentateuch is indeed manifest from remarks like the following (Th. 4. s. 15): "It is certainly strange that circumcision was not practised in the wilderness. It was perhaps thought that while they were wandering there, it would be prejudicial to health." Had the author understood the import of circumcision, and its relation to the covenant, which made it improper and impossible to allow it to that reprobate race, he would have left this shallow and external explanation for Clericus and his imitators.—Here also belongs *Herbst*, who on account of his *Observationes quaedam de Pent. quatuor librorum posterior, auctore et editore*, Ellu-

rangen 1817, (reprinted in t. I. of the *Commentationes theol.* of Rosenmüller, Fuldner and Maurer), has been very erroneously reckoned by some among the defenders of the genuineness of the entire Pentateuch. After all the objections which he makes to the modern criticism, he still cannot bring himself to forsake it entirely. His reverence for the protestant-rationalist leaders is entirely too great. He makes a low bow whenever he mentions one of their names, and humbly begs to be pardoned for his boldness in contradicting them in many things. The fragmentary character of the Pentateuch the *πρώτον ψεῦδος* of the modern criticism, he still holds fast. According to him, scattered writings of Moses were digested into one whole by some later compiler, and furnished with additions so numerous and important that *Jahn's* hypothesis of mere glosses does not meet the case. To avoid the reproach of a *studium novitatis*, he supposes this compiler to have been Ezra. In this he thinks he has the authority of the fathers; whose assertions however as to what Ezra had to do with the Pentateuch have, as we shall show at another time, an entirely different meaning from that maintained by him, Vater, von Bohlen and others. What the author has contributed towards the defence of what he considers of Mosaic origin, is not important. He shows everywhere great shallowness of explanation. Thus for example, the difference of language between Deuteronomy and the other books is accounted for from the long time intervening between their composition. We do not doubt that the worthy author, lately deceased, would, had he lived, have gone beyond the ground taken in this treatise, which, considered as a youthful work, deserves great credit.—Finally we must place here *Bleek*, who has given us his contributions to investigations on the Pentateuch in two articles, the first in Rosenmüller's *Bibl. exeg. Repert.* Bd. 1. Leipzig. 1824, s. 1 ff., the second in the *Studien und Kritiken* 1831. s. 488 ff. According to the second of these, in which an important advance is observable, the result is, that the law contained in the Pentateuch is, in its whole spirit and character, truly Mosaic; and that, not only in regard to the more general moral precepts, but also in regard to the special Levitical laws concerning sacrifices and purifications, which make so large a part of the whole; also that the necessary inference from this is that these books are in their general character truly historical—that these laws suppose just such circumstances and relations of the Jewish people as the histori-

cal parts of the books present to us, (s. 501 ff.) This result is so much more important as it is based entirely on internal grounds, just where the opposers think themselves strongest. What a different face the matter will have when to the internal evidences, which have thus just begun to be used in favor of the Pentateuch, the external are also added.* A programm by

* It is a part of the influence of the great principle of subjectivity, that external evidence has in these times been much undervalued, and internal evidence regarded as the only valid kind of proof. See on this subject the remarks of *Kleinert* in his *Acchtheit des Jesaias*, s. LXXXVI ff. The consequence of this denial of the true relation of external and internal evidence to each other, has lately been illustrated by some striking cases. If *Hamaker*, *Gesenius*, and others had, at first, and before going any further, required the French Marquis to show the stone with the *inscriptio nuper in Cyrenaica reperta*, which he pretended to have in his possession, then the relation of laughing and being laughed at, would have been exactly reversed. *Gesenius* would then have at once discovered what he first perceived *post festum*, that the pretended Phoenician language of the inscription was nothing but Maltese-Arabic gibberish. Had *Gesenius*, instead of inquiring how the proper names in the pretended *Sanchoniathon* agreed with those in his Phoenician inscriptions, insisted upon seeing the Greek manuscript of *Sanchoniathon*, he would not have found it necessary to confess, (in the *Preuss. Staats-Zeitung*,) after painful experience, that it is very dangerous to rely upon internal evidence alone. May this experience produce some fruit also for his biblico-critical labors; and this the rather, because it was in this department that he formed the bad habit which has proved so fatal to him in that of profane literature.

It would be no more than right, for those who in regard to the Bible pronounce at once their decisions, grounded upon internal evidence alone, to try their infallibility of judgment on anonymous productions of the present day, which afford also much more materials for proof of this kind. The author knows beforehand how they would succeed, from the great experience he has had in connection with the paper which he edits. The latest case is that of *Prof. Baur*, who with such confidence, and against all external evidence, denies the Epistles to the Philippians, Timothy, and Titus, to be Paul's, and those ascribed to Peter to be his, and with the same confidence ascribes to the editor the article "on the future character of our theology," referring to the manifest coincidence of ideas with those of the introductory remarks. And now first, after the author has made the assurance that the article does not belong to him, will the acute critic perceive the difference of style and other characteristics, between the article and those remarks. A very striking proof of the deceptive-

Bleek against von Bohlen, said to have lately appeared, the writer has not yet seen.

3. Others maintain the genuineness of the Pentateuch *in its present form*. Many however admit scattered glosses of a later date, and others suppose more important interpolations to have been made. Among these last *Jahn* especially goes so far as to expose his cause to its opposers. It needs not to be mentioned, after the historical development made in the preceding pages, that all these defenders of the genuineness, however they may differ in their ecclesiastical connections, theological

ness of internal evidence is afforded by the book K. L. Reinhold's *Leben und Lit. Wirken*, von E. Reinhold, (Jena, 1825). It is there said, s. 161, "Scarcely had the work '*Kritik der Offenbarung*' appeared, (in Königsberg, spring of 1792, anonymous,) when it was announced in the *Intelligenzblatte der Allg. Lit. Zeitung*, with the remark, 'Every one who has read even the smallest of those writings by which the Königsberg philosopher [Kant] has acquired immortal merits as a benefactor of the human race, will at once recognize the great author of this work.' Hufeland, Prof. of Jurisprudence at Jena, and associate editor of the *A. L. Z.*, made the same assertion in a review written with great warmth, *A. L. Z.* 1792, Nr. 190, 191. When now Kant announced in the *Intelligenzblatte* of that paper, Nr. 102, that the author was Fichte, a candidate of theology, who was for a short time in the preceding year at Königsberg, Hufeland in the *Intelligenzblatte d. A. L. Z.* 1792, Nr. 133, declared by way of explanation, that all the lovers of Kant's philosophy at Jena, including eight academical teachers, as well as almost all friends and enemies of this philosophy in Germany, had had the same opinion of the book, because of its coincidence with Kant's writings not only in style but the whole train of thought. Fichte afterwards wrote another anonymous book, *Beytrag zur Berichtigung der Urtheile über die Franz. Revolution*." According to a letter which he wrote to Reinhold, he had no fear of being discovered as the author, "since not one of our critics will ascribe the language of that book to the author of the work on revelation." "I confidently expected," he continues, "that this argument would be used, if the publisher should give any hints about the true author, and I have not been mistaken. O that the uncertainty of this source of reasoning might, or rather, for the sake of the *incognito* of well-meaning writers, that it might not be discovered. As Kant was not author of the book on revelation, I was charged with skilfully imitating his style—now I should be charged with skilfully dissembling my own; and yet I suppose I could write five or six other books on different subjects, in no one of which any of our common judges of style could find the style of the preceding one, and that without my having this in the least in view when writing them."

views, or internal religious character, yet all agree in being supernaturalists. A historian might still hold to the genuineness without being a supernaturalist—not so the theologian ;—for he could not possibly avoid the theological consequences of this opinion.

At the head of this party stands *J. D. Michaelis*, who in his *Einleitung ins A. T.* s. 171 ff. shows at length, that the opposers of revelation must necessarily deny the genuineness of the Pentateuch. The opposition to the genuineness, which was not fully developed till after his defence of it, found its first able antagonist in *Jahn* partly in his *Einleitung* (Introduction to Old Testament,) and partly in two treatises in *Bengel's Archiv*. Bd. 2, 3. He has been lately joined by two worthy followers of his own church, the acute *Hug* in the two treatises, '*Beytrag zur Geschichte des Sam. Pent.*' Hest 7; *der Freib. Zeitschrift*. s. 27. ff. and '*Untersuchung über das Alter der Schreibkunst bei den Hebräen*;' and *Movers*, in the article, '*über die Auffindung des Gesetzbuches unter Josias, etc.*' in the *Zeitschrift für Philos. u. Kath. Theol.*, Hest 12, Köln, 1834, s. 79 ff. and Hest 13, s. 87 ff. The most important part of this last article is the proof of Jeremiah's and Zephaniah's acquaintance with the Pentateuch shown from prophecies of theirs uttered before this discovery of the book of the law by Hilkiyah.* Of the evangelical Church of Germany are to be mentioned the following: *Kelle* in his '*vorurtheilsfreien Würdigung der Mos. Schriften*,' 3 Hefte Freib. 1811, (not important); *Fritsche*, in his '*Prüfung d. Gründe mit denen neuerlich die Aechtheit d. Bücher Mosis bestritten worden ist*,' Leipz. 1814, (superficial); *Scheibel*, in the '*Untersuchungen über Bibel u. Kirchengeschichte*,' Th. 1. Bresl. 1816, s. 61. ff.; *Kanne*, in his '*Bibl. Auslegungen*,' Erl. 1819, where are found (Th. I. s. 79 ff.) remarks against *Vater's* treatise, (Th. 2. s. 1 ff.) against *De Wette's Beiträge*, and (s. 72 ff.) remarks against *Vater* continued. The author touches only single points, especially alleged contradictions and marks of a later age, and with much that is arbitrary, has some good things ;—*Rosenmueller*, in the 3d edition of his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, who is so bashful and timid with his supernaturalism, that only once where he can get along in no other

* The theory of many, namely, is, that the Pentateuch had never been known before this production of it by the priest Hilkiyah during the reign of Josiah.—Ta.

way, he ventures to say that the author obtained *aliunde* the information which he had no means of knowing himself; *Sack* in his *Apologetik* s. 156 ff., who saw that the defence of the genuineness of the Pentateuch must be based on the overthrow of the hypothesis of its fragmentary character, and pointed out some evidences against the mythical character of the work, hitherto overlooked, especially the intrinsic truth observable in the representation of the different characters, such as no mythical work can show; that "the character of Moses, for example, appears always exactly the same, from his first judicial act, to his laying down the judicial office;" *Ranke*, in his *Untersuchungen ueber den Pentateuch*, (Erlangen, 1834, Th. 1,) the best work on the genuineness that has yet appeared; *Dettinger*, who in his article on Gen. 4: 1—6, 8, in the *Tübing. Zeitschrift*, (1835, Hest, 1. s. 1 ff.), ably shows that the charge of want of connection and of a legendary character, has its origin, especially in the case of this passage, in indolence and superficialness; finally the Licentiate *Bauer*, in his treatise *Der Mosaischer Ursprung der Gesetzgebung des Pent. vertheidigt*, in the *Zeitschr. für speculat. Theol.* 1, 1, (Berl. 1836), s. 140 ff. Of the writings of foreigners, only such belong here as are connected with the researches of the Germans. Here are to be mentioned, besides the work of the Danish bishop *Hertz*, 'Spuren des Pent. in. d. Buechern d. Könige,' Alt. 1822, only the two works of *Pareau*, *Institutio interpretis V. T.* (Utr. 1822,) and 'Disputatio de Mythica sacri codicis interpretatione,' (Utr. 1824.) The latter work especially deserves the most careful attention, which however has in Germany been carefully denied it.

The second difference above mentioned, related to *the historical character* of the accounts of the Pentateuch. It exists among those who agree in rejecting everything supernatural, and also with few exceptions in denying the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. Some of them endeavor to save, out of that part of the Pentateuch which is not opposed to their opinions, *as much as possible for true history*. They asserted the principle, without qualification, that whatever transcended the natural course of things was mythical; everything else approached the character of credible history: (*Meyer, Apologie der Geschichtl. Auffassung des Pent.*, Sulzb. 1811, s. 13). So *Eichhorn*, *Bauer*, *Meyer*, *Bertholdt*, and *Gesenius*, if we may judge from his manner of citing the Pentateuch. The transition to the other view

was commenced by *Vater*, who did not indeed set himself in decided and uniform opposition to the historical character of the accounts of the Pentateuch, and yet satisfied himself generally with a simple 'perhaps' in favor of a historic basis for them, and, by always carefully insisting that nothing certain could be determined on the matter, maintained a position entirely skeptical. But the opposite doctrine was fully developed by *De Wette*, who asserted (See the results, *Kritik*, s. 397. ff.) that *the Pentateuch had no historical character at all—it contained not one fixed historical point—all was mythical—and nothing but the want of metre had denied it the character of poetry which really belonged to it.* *De Wette* is followed in this by *Baur, von Bohlen, Vatke** and others.

That this latter hypothesis has, over the other, the advantage of consistency, that one who takes the mythical ground can avoid it only by determining arbitrarily what is, and what is not history, is so plain that it needs no proof. But that the former one could nevertheless arise, that it can maintain itself after the other has been formed, and after glaring proof of its own arbitrary character, that it continually finds favor anew, and is adopted in particular cases even by those who strictly and entirely reject it in principle—all shows how deeply the Pentateuch is stamped with the impress of an historical character, and so serves as evidence against the mythical interpretations of it in general. This cause of the origin and long duration of an hypothesis which thus stops on half-way ground, is given by *Meyer* himself one of its advocates (l. c. p. 16 :) "These

* How far this last writer goes, is shown by assertions like the following: The book of Genesis affords so little historical material, that it does not even determine the native land of the Patriarchs, (l. c. 184); the relation of Aaron to Moses is to be rejected as unhistorical (s. 227); the Mosaic state has not a historical character (s. 204 ff.); Moses did not establish a connected system of religious worship, and consecrated no race of priests for it (s. 218); it is doubtful whether the Levites were originally a tribe in the same sense as the other tribes (s. 221); doubtful whether the original names of the tribes have come down to us (s. 223). Of holy seasons, he allows only the sabbath and perhaps the new moon to have been ancient; the three great feasts originated in a later age, and still later was the reference given them to the ancient history of the people, etc. etc. The author has only to take one step more, viz. with *Voltaire* (*questions s. l'encyclopedie* § 127), to call upon his opponents to prove that such a man as Moses ever existed.

mythical commentators had yet an obscure feeling, which was produced as well by the whole individual character of some of these ancient traditions, as their definite references to time and place, and their close connection with some later and better established facts, which feeling forbade them to regard every thing as mere fable which they were compelled to explain as mythical." The completion and the carrying out of the thoroughly mythical hypothesis, is then to be regarded as a gratifying advance, for the very reason that it stands in such glaring contradiction with all sound historical feeling;—for it is a general truth that every error must be fully carried out and driven to its extreme before there will be a reaction towards truth. We may rejoice so much more unreservedly at this advance, since that which the half-mythical hypothesis had suffered to remain, was not the sacred but the common history; so that in a religious point of view, nothing is lost or gained by it. But the thoroughly mythical hypothesis might, and indeed with some justice, take the credit of restoring to religion her violated rights, inasmuch as she placed a sacred poesy in the stead of common history. See for instance De Wette's remark (s. 67) in reference to Eichhorn's opinion that circumcision was intended to remove Abraham's unfruitfulness: "What would our pious old theologians say at this! Truly they were theologians, we are not." And (s. 116) in reference to Isaac's getting his wife: "A Hebrew read this narrative as poetry, as connected with his religion and the theocracy, and with a mythical faith—shall we read it otherwise? Shall we destroy and strip off the delicate poetical flowers by a fruitless, tasteless historical handling?" Were this effort to substitute a sacred poesy in the place of common history really an earnest one, this thorough-going mythical hypothesis must be regarded as a forerunner of the truth in still another way. If the *spirit* of the book, so long mistaken and denied, is again restored to its rights, the *history* must also gain something. If the history regarded as poetry, excites religious feeling, touches, edifies, men will no longer be so estranged from it, and the way is open to the adoption of the history as history. For human nature cannot be satisfied simply with ideas or what is ideal; but has an innate irrepressible desire to see them realized in history—for only when the ideal becomes real history, can it be an assurance to us that God is not far off, that he kindly condescends and reveals himself to man, and that a holy life is possi-

ble in this world of sin. But although the principal champion of the mythical interpretation (De Wette) does sometimes do a little towards fulfilling his promise [in the last quotation above] as e. g. in his remarks on the offering up of Isaac (s. 103) and in his discussion against the crude deduction of the doctrine of angels (s. 108,) yet in the general, in direct contradiction to his promise, his effort is only to change common history into common poetry. The good taste which one *obtains* by reading the classic poets must be *brought with him* to the reading of the Hebrew writers (s. 82). — The mythos concerning the cursing of Canaan is very awkwardly conceived, a production of the national hatred of the Hebrews for the people they had conquered (s. 76).—Abraham's intercession for Sodom does no great honor to the taste of the narrator (s. 92).—The account of Lot's daughters is a pure fiction, of a very tasteless and invidious character (s. 94.).—He speaks also in Th. 1. s. 259, of 'sacred legends' and 'moral tirades.'

There is also a difference among those who embrace the thorough-going mythical interpretation of the Pentateuch, inasmuch as some, like De Wette, *satisfy themselves with pulling down*, and actively protest against all building up again; others will also *build up*, as for instance Baur and Vatke. (For Baur see his article '*ueber d. Passahfest u. ueber d. Beschneidung*, *Tueb. Zeitsch. f. Theol.* 1832, Heft 1. s. 40 ff). A spirit of rare boldness is necessary in order to do this; such as could scarcely be found in the department of profane history. *There* every one sees that without stone, nothing but castles in the air can be built. But there are also there none but *common* historians. The *philosophical* historian has *the principles* in accordance with which history *must* develop itself. But *necessity* includes and proves *reality*. Why then should special testimonies be still needed to prove what has really taken place? They are in fact only a hindrance, and we must be glad when we have none of them. For where we have, they do not in the general agree with those principles, and we then have the trouble of modifying, transforming, adapting, and setting them aside. For that the *principles* may not be modified so as to suit the *facts*, is clear enough. Every such contradiction, that is based only on testimonies as to facts, is, for 'science,' and these its priests, of no sort of importance. (See Vatke, s. VII.) Common criticism can only kill; philosophical criticism can also make

alive. It has all within itself, and proclaims aloud, 'I am, and there is none besides me.'

The opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch are divided still further in this, that some of them ascribe a very considerable agency in the formation of the Pentateuch, and its introduction as a sacred book, to *design and deception*; others *endeavor to avoid this supposition* as much as possible. As this supposition of deception is unavoidable on the ground of the antagonists of the Pentateuch, as is hereafter to be shown, it is a testimony in favor of the Pentateuch, that the most endeavor to escape it, or at least (a proof of a bad conscience) try as much as possible to conceal it. See for example *De Wette*, Bd. 1. s. 178 ff. Bd. 2. s. 405 ff. *Vatke* also, however he may generally seek to avoid the supposition of a fraudulent forgery, sometimes admits it. See for example s. 220, where he says Jeremiah charged the priests with it. Only *Gramberg* (*Geschichte d. Religionsideen* Th. 1. s. 63,) and *v. Bohlen* adopt with shameless openness the supposition of deception.

Finally, the views of the opposers of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, *on the relation of the different books to each other, on the time when each book was written, and the time when the whole was collected together and received as the work of Moses*, offer to us a whole host of varieties. (The opinion defended by *De Wette*, viz. that Deuteronomy was the latest of all the books, and is the mythical key-stone of the mythical whole, an opinion which appeared to have gained universal assent, is now beginning to give place to just the opposite one, that Deuteronomy is the very oldest of the whole. See e. g. *George*, l. c. p. 7 ff.) The great principle of 'subjectivity,' here celebrates its triumph. No two of the more important critics agree in their mode of solving the most important problems. It is a war of every man against every man. We had intended to present to the view of our readers the laughable spectacle of these contests, in order that from the confusion and contradiction of the *positive* results of the later criticism, which is consistent with itself no further than its champions are united by a common doctrinal interest, they might form some conclusion about the boasted certainty of their *negative* results. But we feel an unconquerable disgust at the business, and we cannot bring ourselves to enter upon the field of arbitrary speculation, and collect together the masses of fancies that lie scattered there. Every one can easily supply this lack by taking in hand a few

of the works on this subject, and comparing them together. The impression made by such a labor would be apt to resemble that which one gets on visiting a Jews' school.

The Prospect for the Future.

The result of the history of opposition to the Pentateuch just given, is by no means cheering to its defenders. If that opposition has its deep and fixed root in the spirit of the age, if they who do homage to that spirit, must and will continue their opposition, even after all their arguments, which are not based simply on their doctrinal views, have been refuted, and after the genuineness of the Pentateuch has been most plainly proved, then may a man well say, after having laboriously and in the sweat of his brow accomplished the work, I have labored in vain, and spent my strength for nought. But, if on one side the prospect is dark, on the other it is clear and bright. Not *all* have sold themselves unconditionally to the service of the spirit of the day. Many are not disinclined to let the doctrinal principles of the two parties be for the present more or less undecided, and first to inquire which of them conquers on the field of historical criticism. It is these *homines bonae voluntatis* from whom the true laborer may expect his reward. And there is at the present time another encouraging circumstance. Originally the attacks on the Old and the New Testaments went hand in hand. Both opposers and defenders had no other idea but that both must stand or fall together. The Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist for example looked upon the whole sacred history as a closely formed phalanx; and acted on the supposition that with the passage through the Red Sea, he would annul the resurrection of Christ, and with the resurrection also the passage through the Red Sea. *Bauer* wrote a Mythology of the Old and New Testaments. *De Wette* declared openly that the Mythical principles which he had applied to the Pentateuch must also be applied to the New Testament. And how could it be otherwise? The connection between the Old and New Testaments is so intimate and so manifest that every child sees it. The New continually refers back to the Old. How can the forty-years' temptation of the children of Israel in the wilderness be mythical, and the forty-days temptation of Christ which answers to it, be historical? the appearances of angels in the Old Testament mythical, and those in the Gospels historical, when the an-

gels in both are exactly the same even to their names? the miracles of the Old Testament mythical, and those of the New historical, when these last are almost entirely of the same kind, and in their symbolic meaning are based entirely on the Old Testament? Truly, such a transition from fiction to truth, such an apeing of what is human by that which is divine, would be the greatest absurdity imaginable. But the active zeal of those concerned was successful for some time in concealing from themselves and others the manifest absurdity. Religious feeling had awaked anew, but with many not in such strength, as that they could break entirely with the spirit of the age. Their religious feeling made it impossible for them to give up the New Testament; their adherence to the spirit of the age, to receive the Old. For a short time this seemed to go very well: all warning voices were drowned, or even derided and reviled. Then appeared *Strauss's Leben Jesu* (Life of Jesus), and the intrinsic connection of what had been arbitrarily and interestedly separated could be no more denied. The critical course which Strauss took with regard to the Gospels is so entirely the same with that of De Wette in regard to the Pentateuch, that one can hardly see how it is possible to give up here, and still hold on there; especially as Strauss has used great industry in showing that the Old-Testament element, is so considerable in the New, that he who has given up the Old, must also bring himself to reject the New. Just now therefore it is a favorable moment for the defenders of the Old Testament, and especially for those who are laboring to free the foundation with which the whole stands or falls from the rubbish which covers it; for, those who held on to the New Testament on a deeper principle, that of true faith, will now, when the great alternative is placed before them (of adopting the Old Testament, or rejecting both), free from the indifference and aversion they have hitherto felt toward the Old Testament, lend as willing an ear to its defenders as they have hitherto done to its opposers. And how much soever individuals may resist this fatal necessity, the matter will soon come back again to its old position, and there will be left only one great difference viz, between believers and opposers of the Bible.

ARTICLE IX.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

- 1.—*Scripturae Linguaeque Phoeniciae Monumenta quotquot supersunt edita et inedita ad autographorum optimorumque exemplorum fidem edidit, additisque de Scriptura et Lingua Phoenicum commentariis, illustravit Gul. Gesenius. Lipsiae, 1837. pp. 481 to.*

It is well known that Gesenius, some time since, turned aside from the Hebrew Thesaurus to the investigation of the Phoenician language, with the special design of studying its relations to the Hebrew. This work is the fruit of his studies. It consists of a quarto of nearly 500 pages of text, and another thin quarto, containing 76 lithographs of alphabets, coins, inscriptions, etc., very neatly done. Great interest has long been felt in the study of these remains of antiquity. But little progress, however, has hitherto been made in attempts to arrange them and to decipher their meaning. This has been owing to several reasons; one has been a want of the necessary aids to the study. The remains themselves, as well as the commentaries of learned men upon them, are contained in so many works, some of them expensive ones, and widely scattered over many countries, that they could not be collected together without much labor and expense. Besides, the fac similes of the inscriptions are not accurately edited. Some were negligently taken from autographs of little or of no authority. Those editions of the remains whose integrity and fidelity no one could doubt, are so arranged, that one who should confine his attention to the figures, would lose his pains. In the third place, we have wanted a full and critical exposition of Phoenician palaeography, exhibiting at once the observations of former writers, arranged in proper order, and the results of as many new investigations as possible, filling up the immense *lacunae* in this subject left by former writers, and thus laying more stable foundations. The renewed dispute respecting the nature of the Phoenician and Punic dialect, has been a great impediment to progress in these investigations. Bochart and many others have supposed that the Phoenician language, with a few exceptions, was identical with the Hebrew. The late learned Hamaker calls this a perverse and rash opinion, and attempts to show that the Phoenician is composed of forms from all the Semitic dialects.

Such being the circumstances in which this subject is placed, Gesenius has attempted to give, in a regular digest, all the monuments, edited or inedited, which have survived the wreck of Phoenician lite-

ature. Spurious and doubtful remains are rejected. If new monuments, or more perfect copies of those which now exist, should be discovered, these can be appended in a supplement to the present work. In the second place, the author has taken great pains to give the most perfect copies of the existing remains, corrected where it could be done, by the original autographs. About eighteen months were spent by the author, in London and Leyden, in examining and copying some very important relics. Special pains were also taken to ascertain the value of the Phoenician remains in Paris, Italy, Sicily, Malta, Athens, Egypt, North Africa, etc. In the third place, instead of giving a prominent position to a delineation of palaeography, special pains have been taken with the commentaries on the remains themselves. In addition to the remarks on the Numidian and Phoenician letters, particular attention has been given to the subject of the *Libyan* letters, which have hitherto been nearly unknown, and in illustrating whose origin and history palaeographers may now employ their talents. Again, the agreement between the remains of the Phoenician, Punic and Numidian dialects and the Hebrew is pointed out, while what have been regarded as Arabisms, Syraisms, Samaritanisms, etc., are shown to rest on a false interpretation of the examples. All the remains of these dialects, of every age, are collected and arranged in proper order. Great labor has been bestowed on this part.

From these investigations, some valuable light has been drawn for the illustration of sacred and profane studies. The mode of writing the Hebrew language, and the reasons for some of its usages, may be rendered more certain. The Aramaean-Egyptian literature, which was as it were the origin and cradle of written language, is here placed very clearly before us. Certain Hebrew words, and those of rare occurrence in the Old Testament, are explained by the more frequent use of the same in the Phoenician. The pronunciation and grammatical conformation of the Hebrew, which is contained in the Masoretic points, are greatly confirmed by the pronunciation of the Punic language.

We must here close our account of these interesting volumes, by giving a brief synopsis of the contents. *Book I.* Phoenician Palaeography. Literary and bibliographical history, time and countries in which the Phoenician language was used, Phoenician and Numidian alphabet, the Aramaean-Egyptian mode of writing, various kinds of writing which took their rise from Phoenicia, numeral signs. *Book II.* Inscriptions found at Malta, Athens, Sicily, Sardinia, Carthage, Egypt, etc. *Book III.* Phoenician coins. *Book IV.* Phoenician language. Nature and history of the language, remains of the language in inscriptions and coins, remains in Greek and Roman writers, Phoenician and Punic grammar. Various appendices and indices close the work.

2.—*Probus : or Rome in the Third Century. In Letters from Lucius M. Piso from Rome, to Fausta the daughter of Gracchus at Palmyra.* New York : C. S. Francis.—Boston : Joseph H. Francis. 1838. 2 vols. 18mo. pp. 257, 250.

These volumes, written, as we learn, by the Rev. William Ware, late of New York city, are a continuation, in some sort, of the Letters from Palmyra, briefly noticed in the Repository Vol. XI. p. 502. The latter describe Palmyra and its fortunes under Zenobia, and the victories of Aurelian which resulted in the eclipse of that splendid star in the east. A great variety of interesting information is communicated touching contemporaneous manners, customs, arts, sciences, religions, etc., invested in a style of finished elegance. In the character of the Jew, Isaac, the Old Testament faith is attempted to be delineated, and in the character of Probus, the persecuted religion of Jesus. In the volumes before us, we recognize the same graphic powers of description, the same accurate knowledge of classical and ecclesiastical affairs, the same lofty spirit, and the same pure and beautiful style. There are some passages of great power, in which the author succeeds in throwing the deepest interest into his narrative. The characters of Macer, Fronto and Aurelian, are drawn with remarkable distinctness and individuality. The unutterable abominations and the horrible cruelties, which were the sport and the every-day business of the Romans in the decline of the empire, are laid bare by this powerful writer. As in the former case, however, so here, we do not recognize the Christianity of the primitive ages. It is not, if we can judge, the religion which beams on every page of the New Testament. At least, some of the main features of this religion are wanting. The doctrine of the divine unity and of the immortality of the soul are fully recognized. But we do not see an *atoning* and *divine* Saviour. It is "Jesus of Nazareth," "a prophet and messenger of God," "a great moral and religious reformer, endowed with the wisdom and power of the supreme God," "an example of what should afterwards happen to all his followers," etc.* It is "the great God our Saviour," "the God over all blessed forever," "the true God and eternal life," that animate and dignify the writings of Paul and of John. It was not by any means the doctrines of natural religion which strengthened the first Christian martyrs to meet calmly the pincers, the wheel, the lions, and the axe. It was faith in a crucified and almighty Redeemer, who had washed them from their sins in his own blood, and who had saved them from eternal perdition, which filled their souls with holy serenity when their limbs were torn asunder. The volumes have great literary

* See the Defence which Probus made before Aurelian, Vol. II. pp. 151—169.

merit. We are sorry that we must consider the Christianity developed in them to be fundamentally defective.

8.—*Journal of the Statistical Society of London.* No. II. June, 1838. pp. 64. No. III. July, 1838. pp. 70.

The first article in the June No. of this work is on the statistics of the copper mines in Cornwall, by sir Charles Lemon. Previously to A. D. 1700, the copper ore produced in Cornwall was principally, if not wholly, from the tin mines, or at least from mines originally worked for tin. The number of persons employed in the mines in 1837, is calculated to have been 28,000. Between one third and one half are women and boys. About 60,000 tons of coal are annually consumed at the mines. The wages of the people employed in 1837, in the copper mines and in the tin and copper, (so far as the copper is concerned,) were about £416,000. The annual consumption of gunpowder is about 300 tons. The total ores of the county of Cornwall are, on an average, about 128,000 tons. The number of male deaths, between the ages of ten and sixty, in the three great mining parishes, (Gwennah for 18 months, Redruth for 7 years, Illogan for 5 years,) was 452. Of these, 52 were from mine accidents, and 242 from diseases of the chest; the latter caused almost entirely from the effort of ascending from the greatest depths with exhausted strength. Both these causes of mortality are in the process of being removed.

The sixth article is on the mortality of amputation, by B. Phillips F. R. S. The amputations included in the table below, are those of the arm and leg. The whole of them have been performed within the last four years, in civil hospitals, and in the private practice of hospital surgeons.

	Cases.	Deaths.		
France,	203	47	or	23.15 per cent.
Germany,	109	26		23.85
United States,	95	24		25.26
Great Britain,	233	53		22.74
	<hr/> 640	<hr/> 150		

The ninth article contains some statements derived from the annual report of the statistical society of Saxony, presented Dec. 22, 1837. The Directory of the society collects, arranges, and enters into journals, registers, and other books for this purpose, all accurate information which would be serviceable to the *State*. The facts are afterwards methodically transferred to separate ledgers, each appropriated to an especial subject; and those of peculiar importance, which present information directly useful to the public, are extracted and laid before the ministers of the government; while those of more general utility receive publicity in the pages of periodicals.

In a subsequent article, we have some very valuable statistics on the subject of intoxication as the source of crime. Between October, 1832, and July, 1837, just 1000 persons were confined in the jail at Preston for felonies. Of these, 455 or 45½ per cent. arose from drunkenness directly connected with crime.

The first article in the July No. is on the sickness and mortality among the British troops in the West Indies. The number of white troops employed on the Leeward command during the 20 years from 1817 to 1836, has varied from 3265 to 5462, the average being 4333. Of this force there died in 20 years, 7869, being about 85 per 1000 of the strength annually, or nearly six times as many as among the same class of troops in Great Britain, where the mortality is 15 per 1000 annually. Some very valuable remarks are made on the healthfulness of different islands. Tobago is the most remarkable for fever, Dominica for diseases of the bowels and the brain, Barbadoes for those of the lungs, Grenada, for those of the liver, while Trinidad is noted for its dropsies.

The second article is on the relative frequency of pulmonary consumption and diseases of the heart in Great Britain, by John Clendinning M. D., a hospital surgeon in London. Out of a total of 520 to 530 cases examined, from 170 to 180, or about 33 per cent. were cases of disease of the heart. The doctor is inclined to think that there may be considerable exaggeration in respect to the opinion of the number of deaths by pulmonary consumption.—Among the other important articles in this number are observations on emigration from the United Kingdom, on schools in Massachusetts, on the poorest class in Glasgow, etc.

4.—*Meditations on the Last Days of Christ, consisting of ten sermons, preached at Constantinople and Odessa. By William G. Schauffler, Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. Boston: William Pierce, 1837. pp. 380.*

The subjects of these Meditations are, Christ's entrance into Jerusalem; Father, glorify thy name; the great passover; Christ in Gethsemane; capture, arraignment and condemnation of Christ; behold your king; the scene of Golgotha; the penitent thief on the cross; the burial of Christ; the great morning; the walk to Emmaus; the great evening; Thomas's conversion; meeting at the sea of Tiberias; meeting of the five hundred brethren; and the ascension of our Lord.

We ought to ask pardon of our readers for not recommending to them this unassuming volume before. Our attention has been drawn to it by reading a well-written review of it in the *Christian Spectator*. It came into the world rather as an orphan. He who would naturally have cared for it was several thousand miles off. As for the proof-man, it either had none at all, or a very careless one.

Still, all gentle readers will overlook such blemishes for the sake of the golden fruit. The author writes *ex corde*. He looks upon rhetorical rules as the Turk looks upon the infidel, with orthodox contempt. Blair, Campbell, Jameson and other Scotch worthies, we suppose, he never heard of, or at least, he keeps them at a respectful distance. His own cousin-Germans, the methodological, encyclopaedical race meet with as little quarter at his hands. Now, if all writers had as bright parts as Mr. Schauffler, we should have no objection to the extermination of rhetoric. We would ourselves help to its *dethronization*, as the coronation people say. But while men are, as they are, Campbell must be re-printed, and we must not let any Peter the Hermit preach up a crusade against the 'schools.'

All those who love unstudied nature, the outbursts of genuine religious feeling, an unfettered style, graphic delineation, fine religious sensibilities, with no contemptible exegetical talent, will certainly possess themselves of these Meditations. They invest the last days of the Redeemer with a new interest. They lead us back to the Pietists of the Halle school, to the days of Ambrose and Cyprian, or rather to the blessed company who listened to him who spake as never man spake.

5.—*Cursory Views of the State of Religion in France, occasioned by a Journey in 1837. With Thoughts on the means of communicating spiritual good generally. In twelve letters. By John Sheppard, author of "Thoughts on Devotion," etc. London: William Ball, 1838. pp. 148.*

The very copious correspondence of the New York Observer, the communications of our countryman, the Rev. Robert Baird, and the increasing amount of intercourse between this country and France render the re-publication of such volumes as this of Mr. Sheppard unnecessary. The book is, however, characterized by good sense, and serious practical views. The author seems to have travelled in the less frequented parts of the country, and gives us considerable insight into the habits and feelings of the people of the provinces. The letters are on the subject of irreligion, superstitions, efforts of societies, private endeavors, good tokens, various facilities, aid to societies, hints to travellers, motives and objections, additional arguments, the French confessors, and influence of France. Under the last head, there are some striking remarks on the nature of the influence which is exerted by Frenchmen, and of the importance of its being pervaded by the Spirit of Christ.

6.—*First Annual Report of the Morrison Education Society, and Catalogue of books in its library.* Canton: Office of the Chinese Repository, 1838. pp. 136.

The Constitution of the Morrison Education Society was adopted November 9, 1836. Its object is to improve and promote education in China by schools and other means. Chinese youth of any age, of either sex, and in or out of China, may be received under the patronage of the Society. The Report contains some highly valuable remarks on the population of the empire, different classes of people, population of males and females, different kinds of schools, number of scholars, age, books, methods of teaching, hours of study, school-rooms, examinations, rewards and punishments, etc. In Nanhæ, a large district of Canton, two or three tenths of the people devote their lives entirely to literary pursuits. In other districts, not more than four or five tenths can read; and only one or two in a hundred are devoted to literary pursuits for life. The number of Chinese females able to read is very small, probably not more than one in a hundred. Among the most opulent people in Canton, a few female schools have been opened. In respect to the number of years spent at school, there is great diversity. The better course of common education occupies the student five, six, or seven years. The rich generally give their sons the advantage of a full course in the study of the classics, with the opportunity, if they wish it, to compete for literary honors. In common schools, the number varies from ten to forty. Various other interesting particulars respecting the Chinese schools are added. The books belonging to the library of the Morrison Education Society amount to 2,310 volumes; the whole were presented to the Society unsolicited. Thomas R. Colledge, Esq. gave 685 volumes; J. R. Reeves, Esq. 655, and John R. Morrison, Esq. 709. The object of the Society is worthy of all encouragement, and it seems to be prosecuted with praiseworthy energy.

7.—*Assemblée Générale de la Société Evangélique de Genève. Sixième Anniversaire.* Genève, 1837.

The president of this society is M. Henri Tronchin de Lavigny. The Secretary is M. Ch. Gautier-Boissier. The treasurer is M. A. G. Vieusseux. The professors of the theological school are MM. A. G. L. Galland, S. R. L. Gaussen, and H. Merle-d'Aubigne. The objects of the society, and which were supported by its funds last year, are the theological school at Geneva, home and foreign missions, the system of *colportage*, religious libraries, tracts, sacred music, construction of chapels in the departments of the Saône and Loire, etc. Towards all these objects, there were contributed

98,748 francs. The pamphlet contains the opening speech of the president, at the anniversary, the annual report, and the speeches of various individuals. The association are laboring with much energy and good fruit.

8.—*A Discourse on the Traffic in Spirituous Liquors, delivered in the Centre Meeting-House, New Haven, Conn. Feb. 6, 1838.*
By Leonard Bacon, pp. 54.

This sermon has special reference to the laws of the State of Connecticut licensing the sale of ardent spirits. Mr. Bacon takes hold of the subject with a strong hand, not having the fear of the rum-seller before his eyes. It is one of the most fearless and thorough discussions which the temperance reformation has brought forth. He remarks that the license laws are all founded on the idea that the use of ardent spirits is in a high degree dangerous to the individual and to the community. They do not attempt to interfere with the consumption of ardent spirits in families, except in particular cases. They make a wide distinction between selling ardent spirits for the purpose of being used as a drink on the spot, and selling it for the purpose of being carried away and used elsewhere. They make no provision for licensing and tolerating a dram-shop. They are designed to protect the community from the very evils which flow from the dram-shop system. Mr. Bacon then remarks that the business of dram-selling may be prohibited and punished, as a crime against the public policy of the State; it is an offence against public order and comfort; against trade and industry; against property; against the morals of the community; and against health and life. In an appendix, Mr. Bacon has industriously collected a great variety of startling facts. In the city of New Haven, there are eighty places where liquor is sold. Out of 100 adults, who died in the city in 1837, 33 were drunkards. One of the dealers acknowledged that his business was a bad one, but he considered himself merely as executing the will of the Almighty, in *acting as his agent* to inflict a curse on the people.

This sermon well deserves a wide currency in Massachusetts, where the friends of rum-selling, or as they term themselves, the friends of real temperance, are bestirring themselves wonderfully to procure the repeal of the license law which is a bar to their efforts in the promotion of temperance! Some of them are such strenuous advocates for sobriety, that they threaten to drink rum *on principle*. Being men of lofty principles and of the purest patriotism, we presume that *fifteen gallons* will not be too large a quantity for their use. The larger the quantity drunk, the purer the principle.

9.—*The Old Testament, arranged in Historical and Chronological Order, (on the basis of Lightfoot's Chronicle,) in such a manner, that the Books, Chapters, Psalms, Prophecies etc. etc. may be read as One Connected History, in the words of the Authorized Translation. With Notes and Copious Indexes. By the Rev. George Townsend, M. A., Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Northallerton. Revised, Punctuated, Divided into Paragraphs and Parallelisms, Italic Words Reexamined, a Choice and Copious Selection of References given, etc. By the Rev. T. W. Coit, D. D. Late President of Transylvania University.*

The New Testament, Arranged in Historical and Chronological Order ; with Copious Notes on the Principal Subjects in Theology ; The Gospels on the basis of the Harmonies of Lightfoot, Doddridge, Pillington, Newcome, and Michaelis ; The Account of the Resurrection on the Authorities of West, Townson and Cranfield ; The Epistles are inserted in their places, and divided according to the Apostle's Arguments. By the Rev. George Townsend M. A., etc. and the whole Revised, divided into Paragraphs, Punctuated according to the best Critical Texts, the Italic words reexamined, Passages and words of doubtful authority marked, a choice and Copious Selection of Parallel Passages given, etc. By the Rev. T. W. Coit, D. D. etc. Boston : Perkins and Marvin. Philadelphia : Henry Perkins, 1837, and 1838. pp. 1212, 927.

We have copied the title of this valuable work at full length as containing the best explanation of its plan and object which we are able to give in so few words. Our readers will understand that it is **THE BIBLE**, in the words of our common English Translation. But the events recorded in the Bible are here arranged according to the order of time in which they are either known or supposed to have occurred, and the Books, Chapters, Psalms, Prophecies, etc. are so transposed and intermingled as to correspond with the order of succession, in which they are understood to have been originally revealed and recorded.

The peculiar excellence of this edition of the Bible consists in its arrangement. And here it may be proper to remark, for the relief of such as may feel any conscientious scruples on the subject, that the disposition of the several parts of the Bible and its division into chapters and verses are not matters of divine appointment or inspiration. The sentiments and the original language of the Sacred Books may be regarded as inspired ; but the arranging of them is wholly the work of man, as much as the transcribing or the printing of them. The learned author of this arrangement therefore has not performed an unauthorized work. He has accomplished, with immense labor

and research, what has been considered an important desideratum ever since the completion of the canon of Scripture, and what has been attempted by numerous christian divines and scholars, of whose labors he has availed himself in the work now presented to the American public. That this arrangement is in all respects perfect, we neither believe nor affirm. In the reasons for some parts of it we cannot concur with the author. But having examined it with some care, we do not hesitate to pronounce it a great improvement upon previous attempts of the kind.

Our author first arranged the Books of the Old Testament, on the plan of Lightfoot's Chronicle, in such a manner that they might be read as one unbroken history. Then, to render this continuous narrative attractive, and more easily remembered, he divided it into *Periods, Parts and Sections*. By this means the reader who is unable to devote much uninterrupted time to the study of the Old Testament, may, without burthening his memory, take it up and lay it down, as he would any other history or narrative.

The *Periods*—into which this part of Scripture History is divided are *eight*. The *First Period* contains the history of the world and the church from the Creation to the Deluge, and includes the first nine chapters of Genesis. The *Second Period* comprises the history of the time between the dispersion of men and the birth of Moses; and includes the remaining chapters of Genesis, the Book of Job and the first chapter of Exodus. The remaining Periods need not be described in this notice. We have named the above simply to show the reader in what manner the Old Testament history is divided. The *Parts and Sections* under the several Periods are numerous. These too are divided according to the sense of the narrative and the chronology of the events and instructions which they record, without any regard to the enumeration of the chapters and verses in our common English Bibles, which, however, for the convenience of reference, are noticed in small figures in the margin.

Passing from the Old to the New Testament, our author considers the latter as the completion of that great system of religion which began at the fall and will continue till the consummation of all things. The object of this *arrangement*, therefore, is to place before the readers of the New Testament the gradual development of the dispensation of Christ, and the Holy Spirit, in the order in which the true light shone upon the christian church. He begins with a Harmony of the Gospels, in commendation of which we copy the following paragraph from his very able "Introduction."

"All the harmonies which have been hitherto submitted to the world have been formed on one of two plans. The contents of the four Gospels have been arranged in parallel columns, by which means the whole of the sacred narrative is placed at one view before the reader,—or they have been combined into one unbroken story, in which the passages considered by the harmonizer to be unneces-

sary to the illustration of the narrative are arbitrarily rejected. The former produces great confusion in the mind of the student; the latter appears to place the reader too much at the disposal of the author. The former is the *Harmony* strictly so called; the latter is the mere *diatessaron* or *monotessaron*. To avoid the inconveniences of both these systems, I have endeavored to save the reader that embarrassment, which is occasioned by four parallel columns, and at the same time to combine the Gospels into one order without leaving the reader to depend entirely on the judgment of the arranger, in the choice of the interwoven passages. My object has been to unite the advantages of both plans. Every text of Scripture is preserved, as in the first, while the evangelical narrations are formed into one connected history, as in the second; every passage which is rejected from the continuous history being placed at the end of each section, to enable the reader to decide on the propriety of the order which has been adopted."

The Harmony of the Gospels thus constructed is followed by a chronological arrangement of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles to the completion of the Canon of the New Testament, the whole being divided into *fifteen Parts*, and subdivided into numerous sections; after which our author concludes his work with a brief review of the history of the christian church from the close of the apostolic age to the present period.

The Notes appended to the New Testament are copious and highly valuable. With the theological views expressed in these notes we do not in all respects concur. Yet they are learned, pious and instructive, and associated, as they are, with the inspired word of God, unchanged and unadulterated, and arranged in a manner happily adapted to illustrate its meaning and make it its own interpreter, the whole may be read with profit by the candid inquirer after the truth as it is in Jesus Christ.

On the whole, we regard Townsend's arrangement of the Bible as one of the most important and useful publications, which we have been invited to examine. To the enterprising publishers we tender our cordial thanks for the favor they have conferred on the American churches, and especially that they have furnished this standard work in a style so worthy the Boston press, and at a price which will enable individuals and families of moderate means to possess it. We commend it to our readers of every class,—to ministers, to the conductors of Bible classes and to the families that call on the name of the Lord. It is, **THE BIBLE ITS OWN INTERPRETER.**

- 10.—*General History of Civilization in Europe, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution. Translated from the French of M. Guizot, Professor of History to La Faculté des Lettres of Paris and Minister of Public Instruction. First American from the second English Edition.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1838. pp. 346.

We have read enough of this book to be convinced that it deserves more than a passing notice, and more than common praise. It is worthy to be studied; and yet the ease and elegance of its style and the vividness of its descriptions cannot fail to please the taste of the cursory and superficial reader. It is at once highly entertaining and instructive.

The subject here chosen for discussion is one of universal interest to mankind. The history of the civilization of Europe, during the period here contemplated, is the history of the civilization of the world. It is our own history, in this respect, no less than that of our transatlantic contemporaries; and while they possess advantages for its investigation, which are less accessible to us, our interest in the general subject, and the instruction which we may derive from it are no less important and practical than theirs. To American readers, therefore, such works as those of Hallam and Guizot must be peculiarly acceptable.

The work before us is comprised in *fourteen "Lectures,"* and these, in the language of the "Translator's Preface" (dated Oxford, Eng. 1837,) "are fourteen great historical pictures. Still the work is a unity. In the fourteen pictures, collectively, you have one great and entire subject,—the history of civilization in Europe,—and that so told as cannot fail to please and instruct the historian, the student, and the philosopher." We commend it also to the diligent study of christian scholars, as well as of statesmen, legislators, and politicians.

M. Guizot, in these Lectures, furnishes less of a detailed history of the period under consideration, than we find in the works of Hallam on "*The State of Europe during the Middle Ages*" and the "*Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.*" He is also less systematic in his references to original authorities. Yet his work is not deficient in such historical details as are suited to the object he had in view, and he everywhere inspires the reader with confidence that he is master of his subject. He insists, indeed, on the propriety of confining history to facts. But are there no *facts* but such as are material and visible? "There are moral, hidden facts, of a general nature and without a name, of which it is impossible to say that they happened in such a year, or on such a day, but which are just as much facts as battles, wars, and public acts of governments. Such a fact is civilization, which, like any other, may be studied, described, and have its history recounted."

France is the great central point from which he contemplates the fact of European civilization. From this point he looks abroad on the States of Europe, and gathers up the elementary principles of which the present social system has been constructed. He shows us what it derived from the Roman Empire, what was brought into it by the barbarians, by the feudal aristocracy, by the Church, by free cities and communities, and by royalty ; what was the influence of the Crusades, the Reformation, the English Revolution, etc. etc. In all this, his manner is original, grand, and philosophical.

On some of the topics here discussed, we are accustomed to entertain different views from those expressed by our author ; and with our republican and protestant prepossessions, we must still beg leave to differ from him on these points. Yet we admire the candor, as well as the philosophical accuracy, with which he has, in general, presented the combined elements and causes of the existing state of civilization in Europe.

We will only add, in the words of the English translator, that this work of M. Guizot "must be considered as a boon to mankind." We welcome the American edition of it, as a voice from the history of the past, well suited to instruct both our civil and ecclesiastical leaders in regard to the means best adapted to promote the welfare and happiness of our own country, the development of society, the expansion of human intelligence, and the triumph of virtue.

11.—*Letters on Theron and Aspasio. Addressed to the Author by Robert Sandeman. From the fourth Edinburgh edition.* New York : John S. Taylor.—Boston : Weeks, Jordan & Co. 1838. pp. 500.

Robert Sandeman was a native of Scotland, born in 1723. He pursued his studies at Edinburgh preparatory to the clerical profession, but having adopted the sentiments of John Glass, the leader of the Glassites in Scotland, he abandoned the ministry. Though dependent on a secular employment for support, he early distinguished himself as an author, and his followers in England and in this country constituted the sect which are denominated, after his name, *Sandemanians*.

The *Dialogues of Theron and Aspasio* were the work of the distinguished James Hervey of England, author of "*Meditations*," etc., and have been regarded as among the very best efforts of his genius. His views of the nature of faith, and some other points, called forth the Letters of Sandeman, whose title is given above. They were first published in 1757. They attack Hervey's notion of appropriating faith with uncommon acuteness and no little effect. Sandeman strenuously insists that justifying faith is nothing more nor less than the "bare belief of the bare truth," witnessed or testified concerning the person and work of Christ. His style is caustic and se-

vere. He treats what he calls "the popular preachers," as corrupters of the gospel, and consequently as misleading their hearers in the all-important concerns of another world. As such he does not spare them.

The practices of the Sandemanians which may find countenance in this book are their weekly administration of the Lord's supper, their love-feasts, which consist in their dining at each other's houses in the interval between services on the Sabbath, the kiss of charity, etc. etc.

The notion of faith for which the members of this sect contend may be gathered from the following words of Sandeman, who speaking of his Letters, says: "The motto of the title page of this work is, 'One thing is needful;' which he calls the sole requisite to justification or acceptance with God. By the sole requisite he understands the work finished by Christ in his death, proved by his resurrection to be all-sufficient to justify the guilty;—that the whole benefit of the event is conveyed to men only by the apostolic report concerning it; that every one who understands this report to be true, or is persuaded that the event actually took place, as testified by the apostles, is justified and finds relief to his guilty conscience; that he is relieved not by finding any favorable symptom about his own heart, but by finding their report to be true; that the event itself, which is reported, becomes his relief, so soon as it stands true in his mind, and accordingly becomes his faith; that all the divine power which operates on the minds of men, either to give the first relief to their consciences, or to influence them in every part of their obedience, is persuasive power, or the forcible conviction of truth."

They have a plurality of elders, pastors or bishops in each church, who are chosen from among the laity.

In discipline they are strict and severe, separating from the communion and worship of all such religious societies as do not profess the simple truth as their only ground of hope, and walk in obedience thereto. They are not governed by *majorities* in their discipline, but esteem unanimity as absolutely necessary. If a member differs from the rest, he must give up the point or be excluded; and with the excommunicated they hold it unlawful to eat or to drink.

Mr. Sandeman, being invited by some persons in America who had become interested in his writings, came to this country in 1764, and after collecting a few small societies, closed his life in Danbury, Conn. 1771.

The present condition of this sect in Danbury, strikingly exhibits the legitimate results of at least two of the principles maintained by Sandeman. The first is the belief that "the cause of the disallowed Messiah will never prevail in this mortal state, but will remain as a bruised reed and smoking flax," though its enemies will never be

able utterly to break or extinguish it. This belief is suited to extinguish all zeal for the propagation of the gospel, and renders the sect indifferent to its own increase. The second is the principle, named above, requiring absolute *agreement* or unanimity among the members, both in doctrine and practice. This leaves the sect with but little to do but to *agree*. To maintain the truth against opposers and to secure the unanimity of their own body by excommunicating all who disagree, is the sum of their direct responsibilities. Thus the Society in Danbury, which, at the death of Sandeman, was numerous, has maintained its unanimity at the expense of its numbers, for more than sixty years, until it has become reduced to only six or eight members, who will probably continue to *agree* until what they believe to be wisdom shall die with them.

On the whole, we do not believe that much good will be accomplished by the re-publication of *Sandeman's Letters*. The anonymous editor of this edition acknowledges that "the name of its author has long been under reproach, and will probably so continue to be, while the memory of these letters shall endure." His sole object in bringing this work again before the public, he says, "lies in the deliberate conviction which the editor entertains, of its being a far more faithful exhibition of gospel truth than any other work which has ever come to his knowledge." In this conviction we have no doubt of his sincerity. But we differ from him in opinion, as he seems to anticipate, in the above quoted sentences, that most Christians will. We do not mean to condemn Sandemanianism in the gross. There are many things in the system which are worthy of serious attention. It contains much important truth, yet so blended with error as greatly to endanger its salutary efficacy. Andrew Fuller remarks, in his masterly "*Strictures on Sandemanianism*," that "Sandeman has expunged from Christianity a great deal of false religion; but whether he has exhibited that of Christ and his apostles is another question."

12.—*The Biblical Analysis; or a Topical Arrangement of the Instructions of the Holy Scriptures. Adapted to the use of Ministers, Sabbath School and Bible Class Teachers, Family Worship and private meditation. Compiled by J. U. Parsons.* Boston: Whipple and Damrell, 1837. pp. 311.

Though this work has been more than a year before the public, we have not until recently given it a careful examination. Prepared, as we now are, to appreciate its merits, we could not be easily persuaded to part with it. Its design is similar to that of "*Gaston's Collections*," or "*Concordance*," so extensively used by clergymen in this country for the last thirty years. Its plan, however, is a decided improvement upon that of Gaston, and appears to us to have been executed with more discrimination and better judgment.

The work consists of an arrangement of the numerous topics of Scripture instruction and a collection of pertinent texts under each. It has been prepared, as the compiler informs us, without much aid from the concordance, or any similar work, but from a consecutive reading of the Bible. It does not profess to be a *digest* of religious truth and duty, but an attempt to present divine truth in its due proportions, by giving to the passages arranged under each leading topic about the comparative space which they occupy in the Scriptures. The student of the Bible, with the help of this Analysis and arrangement, will be surprised at the comparative fulness exhibited in the symmetry in which the several topics come from the mind of the Spirit.

We are happy to learn that another edition of this work is contemplated. It is well adapted to the several classes of readers named in its title page, and needs only to be known to be appreciated.

- 13.—*Fragments from the Study of a Pastor.* By Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York. Vol. I. New York: John S. Taylor, 1838. pp. 160.

This little volume is in Dr. Spring's best style, and is adapted at once to please and instruct. The *fragments* embraced in it are presented in seven Numbers, with the following titles ;—The Church in the wilderness,—Reflections on the new year,—The Inquiring Meeting,—Letter to a Young Clergyman,—The Panorama,—Moral Graduation,—The Useful Christian.

The announcement of this as Vol. I, indicates that the author intends it as the beginning of a series. Those who read the first will be solicitous to see his subsequent volumes.

- 14.—*Introduction to the German Language, comprising a German Grammar, with an Appendix of important Tables and other Matter; and a German Reader, consisting of Selections from the Classical Literature of Germany, accompanied by Explanatory Notes and a Vocabulary adapted to the Selections.* By David Fosdick, Jr. Andover and New York: Gould & Newman, 1838. pp. 270. 12mo.

We have had considerable experience in the use of German grammars, and we have never found any one exactly to our mind. The reason we suppose to be that they were all made by native Germans. The authors did not understand the wants of English students. Familiar with the tongue from their infant days, they imagined that foreign students would experience as little difficulty. They expended their principal labor on points important only to the advanced student. Noehden's grammar is the best which we have seen. The author was a sensible man, considerably familiar with teaching the language

to Englishmen, and himself pretty well acquainted with the English idioms; yet this grammar is not, in all respects, a proper one for beginners. It discusses too much the less important points—such as would be interesting to an experienced reader, or even to such men as Adelung and Grimm. The arrangement, too, is not the most perfect. The prominent points, which are to be committed to memory, are not kept sufficiently distinct from matters of inferior interest. The novice is bewildered. Besides, there are some things wanting which ought to be found in the Appendix—things perfectly familiar to a native, but which a poor English scholar must search volume after volume before he can find. We refer to abbreviations, etc.

We have not yet made ourselves particularly acquainted with Mr. Fosdick's grammar named at the head of this article. From an examination, however, of some part of it in manuscript, we have no doubt but that it will meet the wants of the youthful student in German. Mr. Fosdick has been, for many years, engaged in the study of this language in circumstances well adapted to qualify him for his task. If he has not made a better school grammar than either of his predecessors, he will certainly be much in fault, as he had the advantage of all the previous light and darkness on the subject. Those who have read his translations of Hug's Introduction to the New Testament, and of De Sacy's Principles of General Grammar, will have a right to expect in the present undertaking a clear, well-arranged, and accurate manual. We presume they will not be disappointed. One hundred and eight pages are occupied with the grammar. In an Appendix of about fifty pages, there are lists of irregular verbs, compound verbs, different classes of nouns, prepositions, German versification, abbreviations, etc. Then succeed selections from the writings of Lessing, Krumacher, Gessner, Herder, Engel, Richter, Goethe, Novalis, Schiller, Gleim, Willamov, Nicolai, Klopstock, Körner, Bürger, Haller, A. W. Schlegel, etc. The remainder of the volume is occupied with a vocabulary. We may notice the work more at length hereafter.

ARTICLE X.

LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

United States.

THE VAN ESS LIBRARY.—We announced in the July No. of the Repository that the New York Theological Seminary had purchased the valuable Library of the Rev. Dr. Leander Van Ess of Bavaria in Germany. We since learn by a letter from the agent for the purchase, Mr. Wolf of Erlan-

gen to the Rev. Dr. McAuley of New York, that the Library contains 14,000 volumes, among which are many rare and precious books. We copy the following from Mr. Wolf's letter in his own words.—“There is a very rare collection of all the Pamphlets of the Reformation. It comes from the Monastery of St. Mary in Westphalia. It was in this Monastery that Dr. Van Ess was in his youth, when the King of Prussia suppressed all the monasteries. Before the edict of suppression was promulgated, the monks, who foresaw the lot of their monasteries, sought each to secure something for himself, considering this suppression as a robbery. Dr. Van Ess, for his share, took many works of the Library. There was, besides, a little retired closet, under double bolts, upon which was the inscription “*Libri Prohibiti.*” Dr. Van Ess was the only one who had a key to this formidable place, and thence he procured that valuable collection of Pamphlets and writings of the Reformation which the monastery had taken care to complete even in the time of the Reformation.”

Public notice has already been given of the establishment of a fourth year of study in the Andover Theological Seminary. It has been thought to be desirable by the trustees and friends of the institution, on several accounts, that an experiment of this kind should be made. The library of the institution is of great value, particularly in the departments of German and of the oriental tongues. The existence in Andover of a press with types in *eleven* languages, the present number of instructors in the institution, and its vicinity to Boston (about one hour's distance,) and to the large libraries in the neighborhood, furnish, it is thought, ample grounds and facilities for a new and more enlarged course of study. A class will be organized on the 24th of the present month (October). It will embrace all such, as may offer themselves, who have completed a regular three years' course of study at any theological seminary, or who have made acquisitions substantially equivalent to a regular theological education. A systematic plan of studies will be pursued, comprising the higher branches in biblical literature, christian theology and ethics, history of the christian doctrines, and sacred rhetoric. Particular attention will be given to the investigation of the original languages of the Scriptures and to kindred subjects. Instruction will be given both by recitations and by lectures. Opportunities will probably be offered for forming private classes for the study of the German, Arabic, etc. as the necessities of the students may require. Valuable opportunities for study will be afforded to such individuals as are expecting to engage in foreign missions or in the translation of the Scriptures.

There have been some important alterations proposed in the course of studies at Harvard University. One of these is the substitution of certain studies in the ancient and modern languages for the higher branches of mathematics. At the close of the Freshman year, all the students will have the option of proceeding further with the mathematics, or of taking some one of several specified courses in other branches. The plan may be found to be a good one, but we have our doubts about it.

*Arabia and Palestine.**Remarks of Prof. Robinson.*

Our readers are aware that Prof. Robinson of the New York Theological Seminary is pursuing his researches in the East preparatory to the publication of a Geography of the Holy Land. High expectations are entertained of the value of these researches to the cause of Biblical Science. The following interesting particulars are furnished by a letter from Dr. Robinson to the Rev. Dr. McAuley, dated Jerusalem, April 30, 1838.

"At length," says Dr. R. "my feet stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem! A gracious God has brought us as on eagles' wings through the great and terrible wilderness; and here, in this city, where of old Jehovah dwelt, and where our Redeemer taught and suffered, we are permitted to hold sweet converse with all our brethren of the Syrian mission, and to celebrate with them the Saviour's dying love in the place where he instituted the ordinance in commemoration of his death."

Journey across the Desert.

"I wrote you on the 2d of March from Cairo, which city I regard as the starting point of my real journey. Mr. Cheever left us there, preferring to go by way of Alexandria and Beirut; but he was taken ill, and was unable to accomplish his object.

"Our party, consisting of Rev. Mr. Smith, Mr. Adger and myself, left Cairo March 12th and reached Mt. Sinai on the 23d. There we remained five days; and then set off for Akaba on the 29th, where we arrived April 4th. It had been our intention to go hence to Wady Mousa, with Arabs of the Alouin tribe; but finding they were encamped at a great distance, and that we must be detained six or seven days, we preferred to keep our Towara Arabs and take the road across the great western desert to Gaza or Hebron, as the case might be, the way being for several days the same. This is a route as yet untrodden by modern travellers. We left Akaba on the 5th of April, and reached Hebron and Jerusalem on Saturday the 14th, where we were welcomed to a home in the houses of our missionary brethren, Whiting and Lanneau."

American Clergymen assembled at Jerusalem.

"Here we had the pleasure of finding all the members of the Syrian mission, (excepting Mr. Pease of Cyprus,) assembled to hold their general meeting. All the family from Beirut was present. We form altogether a band of ten American ministers of the Gospel; Mr. Nicolayson is the eleventh; and within two or three days Mr. Paxton of Beirut has arrived with his family. Probably so large a number of Protestant clergymen never met in the Holy City,—certainly not from the new world."

Passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea.

"The results of our journey thus far have been much more important and satisfactory than I could have anticipated. At the Red Sea both Mr. Smith

and myself were able to satisfy ourselves that the passage of the Israelites must have taken place at or near Suez, it being, of course, impossible, after the lapse of so many ages, to point out the exact spot. We suppose it may have taken place a mile or two below Suez, where even now the shoals from the opposite sides come near together, and where at very low tides the Arabs can wade through, though the water is up to their necks. On the east side of the Sea, we could trace the route of the Israelites through the desert of Shin to Eliud and beyond, where they encamped 'by the Red Sea.' (Num. 33: 11.) This we have no doubt was at the mouth of the Wady Taybe."

Site of Mount Sinai.

"To Sinai itself we came with some incredulity, wishing to investigate the point whether there was any probable ground, beyond monkish tradition, for fixing upon the present supposed site. We were both surprised and gratified to find here, in the inmost recesses of these dark and lofty granite mountains, a fine plain spread out before the foot of the so-called Horeb,—a plain capable of containing two or three millions of people;—from the south end of which the mountain rises perpendicularly and overlooks the whole,—so that whatever passed upon its top would be visible to all. This part of the mountain is about 1200 feet above the plain;—the *summit* now called Sinai is about two miles further South, and is not visible from below. With *that* summit Moses probably had no concern. South West of this is Mount St. Catharine, 2700 feet above the plain, and nearly 1000 feet higher than Gebel Mousa, or Sinai. We made minute and particular inquiries of Arabs and others acquainted with the whole peninsula, and could not learn that there was so much room in any other spot among the mountains, certainly not in the vicinity of any of the loftier peaks."

Description of the Desert.

"Our journey through the great desert, this side of Akaba, was deeply interesting. Of the nature of the whole region which we traversed you may judge from the fact, that from the borders of the Nile till we arrived on the borders of Palestine, we saw not one drop of running water, nor a single blade of grass, except a few small tufts in two instances. The Wadys or water-courses of the desert and mountains are sprinkled with skirts and tufts of herbs, on which the camel and flocks of sheep and goats brouse; but no horses nor neat cattle are found throughout the whole region. It is true, the present is a year of dearth, scarcely any rain having now fallen for two seasons. When there is rain in plenty, then, comparatively, the desert may be said to bud and blossom, and grass springs up over a great portion of its surface. In such a season the Arabs say they are 'Kings.'"

Ancient Ruins.

"On this route we found the ruins of the ancient Roman places, Eboda and Elusa; and also those of Beersheba, 28 miles S. W. of Hebron,

still called Birseba. There are two wells of fine water, over 40 feet deep, one 12 1-2 feet diameter and the other about 6, walled up with solid masonry, the bottoms dug out of the solid rock. Close by are ruins as of a large straggling village, corresponding entirely to the description of it by Eusebius and Jerome."

Antiquities of Jerusalem.

"In Jerusalem we are surprised to find how much of antiquity remains, which no traveller has ever mentioned, or apparently ever seen. The walls around the great area of the mosque of Omar are without all question, those built by Herod around the area of his temple; the size, position and character of the stones, (one of them 30 1-2 feet long, and many over 20 feet,) show this of themselves; but it is further demonstrated by the fact, that near the S. W. corner there still remains, in a part of the wall, the foot of an immense arch evidently belonging to the bridge which anciently led from the temple to the Xystus on Mt. Sion; (Josephus J. 6. 6. 2.) This no one appears ever to have seen. In the castle near the Yaffa gate is also an ancient tower of stones like those of the temple, corresponding precisely to Josephus's description of the tower Hippicus, (B. J. 5. 4. 3.) which Titus left standing as a memento;—the ancient part is over 40 feet high, and built solid without any room within. We have no doubt that it is Hippicus.

We have thus gained some important fixed points, from which to start in applying the ancient descriptions of the city. We have been able also to trace to a considerable distance the ancient wall N. W. and N. of the present city. The pool of Siloam at the mouth of the Tyropecum, (see Catherwood's plan,) is without doubt the Siloam of Josephus, and the wall of Nehemiah, further down is the En-Rogel of Scripture, where the border of Judah and Benjamin passed up the valley of Hinnon. We have found further that there is a living fountain of water deep under the mosque of Omar, which is doubtless ancient; the water has just the taste of that of Siloam, and we conjecture a connection between them. This point we have yet to examine. We have not completed the half of what we wish to investigate in this city, and could spend another month or two, with profit, in the like researches here."

Further Researches Proposed.

"Our plan is to make excursions from this city to the neighboring sites of ancient places,—to Jericho and the Jordan, and also a longer one to Gaza, thence to Hebron, and thence to Wady Mousa, so as to explore the north end of the Ghor and the region of the Dead Sea. I hope to find some trace of Kadesh and other cities in that region. From all the information we can get, it would seem that in the rainy seasons, when water runs in the Ghor, it flows northward towards the Dead Sea, thus contradicting the hypothesis that the Jordan once flowed through it to the ——— Gulf. Afterwards we hope to go north, examine the sources of the Jordan and other points as far as Damascus, and then pass from Beirout to Smyrna. All this, if the Lord will, and as he will."

Great Britain.

University of Oxford. Summary of members, January 1838. The first column denotes the total number on the books of each college, and the second, the number of those who are members of the convocation :—

Christ Church	903	481	Pembroke	181	105
Brasenose	394	227	Magdalen	169	126
Oriel	318	163	New	150	70
Exeter	313	127	Jesus	146	53
Balliol	303	127	Lincoln	131	66
Trinity	280	116	Merton	130	66
Queen's	265	180	Corpus	119	86
Wadham	245	87	All Souls	104	78
Worcester	239	104	St. Edmund Hall	100	53
University	234	119	St. Mary Hall	56	23
St. John's	228	117	New Inn Hall	49	5
Magdalen Hall	182	57	St. Alban Hall	25	10
Total members on the Boards	.	.	.	5264	
" " of Convocation	.	.	.	2646	

University of Cambridge. Summary of members in January 1838. The first column denotes the total number on the boards of each college, and the second the number of those who are members of the Senate :

Trinity	1698	864	Magdalen	188	84
St. John's	1087	564	Jesus	179	78
Queen's	353	130	Clare Hall	169	80
Caius	280	124	Trinity Hall	139	45
Corpus	227	90	Pembroke	124	55
Christ's	222	99	King's	100	79
Emmanuel	220	114	Sidney	101	55
St. Peter's	205	98	Downing	50	28
Catherine Hall	203	75	Commorantes in Villa	0	11
Total members on the books	.	.	.	5555	
Total members of the Senate	.	.	.	2663	

King's College, London. From the Report, delivered at the Annual meeting held on the 28th of April, it appears that the Students amounted, in the year ending at Christmas, to 665 ; and consisted of 116 regular students and 60 medical in the senior department, and 346 pupils in the junior, with 146 students who attended particular courses of lectures. Queen Victoria has become patroness of the College.

University College, London. On the 28th of April, a distribution of prizes to the medical students took place. There had been an increase of 57 pupils in the faculty of medicine and the arts.

The receipts of the British and Foreign Bible Society, during the last year, were £97,237. 1. 11. Expenditures £91,179. 14. 11.

Rev. G. S. Faber has lately published an inquiry into the History and Theology of the ancient Vallenses and Albigenses.—Rev. J. S. Stapleton has translated from the German, Dr. Neander's Life of Chrysostom.

France.

De Sacy published, a few days before his death, a work entitled "*Exposé des Doctrines des Druses.*" This contains the results of the author's long-continued inquiries respecting the religion of this famous sect. The materials were found in 123 Arabic manuscripts.

Germany.

Professor Freytag is publishing a complete collection of Arabic proverbs with a Latin translation and notes. His Arabic lexicon in four volumes, as well as his smaller Arabic lexicon in one volume, are published. — Ch. H. Weise of Leipsic has published "*Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch dargestellt.*" — O. T. A. Fritzsche has brought out at Halle a work on the Epistle to the Romans. — Ewald of Göttingen has accepted a professorship of oriental languages at Tübingen.—A new scientific and critical periodical has been started at Halle, under the title of "*Hallische Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Kunst.*" A number will appear every day except Sunday. Among the contributors are Creuzer, Dahlmann, Danz, Dietz, Droysen, Ewald, Gans, J. and W. Grimm, Gruppe, Hermann, Hitzig, Keller, Lassen, Matthæi, Ranke, C. Raumer, Dr. Strauss, (of Berlin), Uhland, De Wette, and numerous others. The subscription per annum will be £3. —Berlin contains at present eighty-five booksellers, twenty-nine second-hand booksellers, about fifty circulating libraries, and four paper manufactories.

Italy.

Angelo Mai has been made a cardinal by the pope.

Greece.

A new and thoroughly revised version of the Arabic Bible is soon to be commenced under the care of the Rev. Mr. Schlienz of Malta. The want of such a version has long been felt by the oriental churches, which, notwithstanding their depressed state, have made some efforts to supply this want. Mr. Levees and Mr. Bambas are now occupied in the revision of the New Testament in modern Greek.—A fount of Armenian type has been forwarded to the American missionaries at Smyrna, and a revised edition of the Armenian N. T. was shortly to be entered on at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The printing of the Wallachian N. T. is soon to be commenced. Mr. Levees has just completed the first translation of the Old Testament into modern Greek which has been given to the public.

Egypt.

An eastern female education society lately formed in England has sent out two young ladies as school teachers to Egypt, Miss Holliday and Miss Rogers. On the 7th of March last Miss Holliday was officially waited on by one of the officers of State, Hekekyan Effendi, who had come directly from Mohammed Ali, and formally asked her if she would take in charge the education of the royal females, consisting of a hundred in number, principally Mohammed's daughters, nieces and nearest relatives. Hekekyan said, "This is only the beginning of female education in Egypt, for the pasha has much larger views; but he wishes first to try the experiment on his old family. Much depends on the approbation of his eldest daughter, whether instruction shall spread through the country; only gain her favor and regard, and you will carry every point to your utmost wishes." Miss H. expected to enter on this work as soon as she had completed the necessary preparations. The pasha has a college of translators, composed of 150 young Arabs, many of whom understand the French language. There are also a few English translators, young Turks and Arabs, who were brought up in London by the orders of the pasha.

Central Asia.

We perceive by the papers, that a British steam-boat has just ascended the Euphrates to that point on the river whence the direct overland journey to Aleppo commences. No obstruction was experienced from the Arab tribes. The boat proceeded against the current at about the rate of four or five miles an hour. This passage is considered as having settled the practicability of steam-boat navigation on the river. — It does not appear that Russia is making much progress in her efforts to subdue the tribes on the Caucasus. Her disciplined armies find little opportunity to show their powers among those wild mountaineers. What the ulterior objects of this ambitious monarchy are, it is not difficult to divine. Her wide-grasping arms extend from China to the *Ægean*. She keeps a good lookout on Constantinople, on Persia and on the regions of Transoxiana. How far Russia entertains any real intention of checking the British power in India, we cannot tell. That Britain has strong jealousies in this matter no one can deny. In the advance of British power, every philanthropist, we think, must rejoice. It is the progress of civilization, learning and pure religion. The Russian influence on these half barbarous nations is clearly a mixed one. Some improvements are introduced. Better roads and bridges are formed. Something like a police is established. Life and liberty are not exposed to so many hazards. On the other hand, there seems to be but little freedom of opinion. The great mass of the Russians themselves are but imperfectly civilized. How can they greatly contribute to the improvement of the Armenians, Georgians, Turks and Persians, especially when we take into ac-

count the religion of the Russians. We shall watch the progress of this great contest of England and Russia, where Asia is the foot-ball, with the intensest interest. What may be the designs of Providence, we cannot, of course, fathom. We cannot but hope, however, that it will tend greatly to the spread of pure Christianity, and to the introduction of a new element of life into the torpid and worn-out dynasties of middle Asia.

China.

We are glad to see that Mr. Medhurst's history of China is now published. We had hoped to review it in the present number of the Repository, but we did not receive it in season. From the character and opportunities of the author we have strong hopes that the book will add much to our knowledge of this immense empire. It takes up the subject of the chronology of China, extent, probable population, civilization, government and laws, language and literature, religions, Catholic missions, Protestant missions to Canton, Malacca, Batavia, voyages up the coast of China, subsequent occurrence, class of laborers required for China, desiderata for the Chinese mission.—Mr. Medhurst's history, the Chinese Repository and Davis's History of China, (noticed in the Repository, Vol. X. p. 231,) will furnish excellent materials for obtaining a very correct view of the celestial empire.—The Missionary Herald for September contains a specimen of the Chinese metal types prepared by Mr. Dyer, missionary of the London Missionary Society at Malacca. The punches and matrices are the property of that Society, and founts of type will be furnished for benevolent purposes at the cost price. The whole number of characters in the original fount is 3,232; to which it is in contemplation to add another list of 1,648 characters. The cost of a fount is about \$500. The presses in connection with the missions of the American Board, in communities where the Chinese language is used, will be furnished with founts.

INDEX TO VOL. XII.

A.

Active obedience of Christ, views of the early reformers on, 420.

Analogies between Nature, Providence and Grace. The order of proceeding in each is gradual 22. Improvement or advancement in each 23. Types and prophecies 26. The earlier stages in each preparatory to the later 29. Economical wisdom in each 31. Similar distinctions of time, space, rank, etc. 32. The same end sought in each 35. *Remarks*. Analogy affords the best means of answering objections against science and religion 40. Important to study nature and providence 41. Our duty to fall in with the analogies of nature, providence and grace 44.

Anderson, Rev. Rufus, D. D. on Missionary Schools 87.

Andover Theol. Sem. fourth year of study in 509.

Angels, the scriptural idea of. The existence of a world of spirits, a subject of experience and observation 356. Proved by analogy 357. Taught by the religious philosophy of every age 359. The Scriptures frequently notice spiritual intelligences,—their names and titles 360. Explained 361. Not personifications, but real existences 370. The term spirit, *πνεῦμα*, etc. explained 371. In the Scriptures, angels appear with bodies 372. No distinction of sex, of prodigious stature, etc. 374. Constitute a celestial hierarchy 375. The seraphim 376. The archangel 377. The number of angels very great 378. *Sheol* and *hades* explained 379. Angels never die 380. Not mentioned in the Mosaic account of the creation 381. The ultimate design of God, the happiness of his

creatures 383. The notion of the Christian Fathers respecting guardian angels 385. The world of spirits not at a great distance,—we are in the midst of it 387.

Arabian Desert 510, 511.

Arabic Bible 515.

Armenia, works lately published in 256.

Authority, a source of moral obligation. The prevailing spirit of insubordination 276. A sense of obligation awakened from two sources, the *nature of things* and *authority*. The latter only considered. I. Why is authority necessary as a source of obligation? 277. Different theories 278. Authority necessary because, 1. There are many purposes essential to the government of society, which cannot be gained by leaving mankind to the separate decisions of each one's intuitive or reflective perceptions 280.—2. Additional sanctions to moral obligation necessary 283. II. What is the test of legitimate authority? The propriety of the relation between the sovereign and the subject to be consulted 286. There must be competent qualifications 287. Legislation must not contravene the claims of natural obligation 289. It must not conflict with any higher authority 290. Authority may give obligation to that which would otherwise have been a matter of indifference 291. Refusal to obey, unless the unreasonableness of the precept be exhibited, makes a man either a rebel or an outlaw 293. The spirit of law fills the whole field of its jurisdiction 293. Disobedience to the lowest rightful authority, as truly sin as disobedience to the highest 294.

B.

- Bacon, Leonard*, on traffic in spirituous liquors 499.
Ballantine, Rev. E. Translation of Hengstenberg on the causes of the denial of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch 458.
Bar, a member of the New York, on Presbyterianism 219.
Baron De Sacy, notice of 254.
Biblical Analysis 506.
Bush, Prof. G. Commentary on Genesis, notice of 241.

C.

- Cambridge University, England* 513.
Central Asia 516.
China, 498, 516.
China, notice of 256.
Chronological Arrangement of the Bible 500.
Church, the Presbyterian, state of 219.
Cicronis, M. T. ad Quintum fratrem dialogi tres de oratore, notice of 252.
Civilization in Europe, general history of 503.
Copper Mines in Cornwall 495.
Critical Notices 238, 492.
Cudworth, Ralph, D. D. True intellectual system of the universe 242.

D.

- Denial of the Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch*, causes of the 458.
Dillaway, C. K. Cicero de oratore, notice of 252.

F.

- Early Reformers*, views of, on faith 179. And on the active obedience of Christ 420.
Ecclesiastes, the philosophy of 197. To what description of work does the book belong? 198. Its style compared with that of Job 199. With the proverbs of Solomon and the maxims of profane authors 202. The object of the book and its contents 205. The results of its inquiries 211.
Ecclesiastical and Voluntary associations for the promotion of benevolent objects 257.
Editor on the state of the Presbyterian church 219.

Education, home, notice of 251.

Education in China 498.

Edwards, Prof. B. B. on the study of the Hebrew language 113.

F.

- Faith*, views of the early reformers on 179. Dr. Junkin's charge against Mr. Barnes 179. Views of Luther 181. The Augsburg Confession 185. Acts of the Colloquium Marpurgense 186. The Confession of Bohemia, Cloppenburg, Tilenus & Gomar 187. All assert that faith is not confidence. Dr. Pareus 192. Wendeline makes faith of three parts, notion, assent, and confidence 193. Polanus makes it a full and sure persuasion 195.
Fosdick's German Grammar 507.
Fourth year of study at Andover 509.
Fragments from the study of a pastor 507.
France, state of religion in 497.

G.

- Genesis, commentary on*, by Prof. Bush 241.
Geneva Evangelical Society 498.
Geology and Revelation. 1. The apparent discrepancy between the deductions of geology and the Mosaic account respecting the age of the world 2. The latter misunderstood 3. Explained 4. Objections answered 7. Geology illustrates and supports revelation, by teaching that this world had a beginning 8. That it is the workmanship of one God, etc. 9. That men and the present races of animals have existed on it only a few thousand years 10. That it has been covered with a deluge 11. That it will be destroyed by fire, etc. 13. The disappointment of infidels 15. An appeal to the reader 18.
Germany, 514.
 „ works lately published in 255.
German Grammar 507.
Gesenius on Phoenician monuments noticed 492.
Gospel, Matthew's, inquiry respecting the original language of, etc. 315.
Grammar, critical, of the Hebrew language, notice of 247.

Great Britain, intelligence from 513.
Greenough, W. W. on the version of
 Ulphilas and the Moeso-Gothic
 language 295.
Guizot on civilization in Europe 503.

H.

Harvard University, alterations in
 course of study 509.
Head of the Church Head over all
 things, concluded 22.
Hebrew language, reasons for the
 study of 113. Importance attached
 to it by the earliest planters of
 New England 114. It is the com-
 mon privilege of all the professions
 118. Examples in France, Eng-
 land, and Germany 119. It
 strengthens the faith of the student
 in the genuineness and authority
 of the Scriptures 122. Its influ-
 ence on the imagination and taste
 125. Its bearing upon the mission-
 ary enterprise 129.
Hebrew language, a critical grammar
 of, by I. Nordheimer, notice of
 247.
Hengstenberg on the causes of the
 denial of the Mosaic origin of the
 Pentateuch 458.
Hickok, Rev. Prof. L. P. Authority
 a source of moral obligation 276.
Holt, Rev. Edwin, on Universalism
 70.
Home Education, by the author of
 Natural History of Enthusiasm, no-
 tice of 251.
Hubbard, F. M. Translation of
 Schweighauser on the theology of
 Socrates 47.

I.

Intellectual System of the Universe,
 Cudworth's, notice of 242.
Intelligence, literary and miscellane-
 ous 253.
Italy, 515.

J.

Jerusalem, antiquities of 512.

L.

Landis, Rev. R. W. Views of the
 early reformers on justification,
 faith, and the active obedience of
 Christ 179 and 420.
Library of the New York theological
 ' seminary 253.

Lovejoy, Rev. E. P., memoir of noticed
 249.

M.

Martineau, Miss Harriet, works of
 reviewed 389. Her northern birth
 suspected 390. Her prepossessions
 in our favor, means of information,
 at home everywhere except among
 orthodox Christians, Unitarians her
 chosen companions 391. Her re-
 marks on political institutions and
 distinguished men 392. Her sec-
 tion on the "political non-exist-
 ence of women" severely censured
 393. Its morality considered 396.
 Its bearing upon slaves and free
 blacks 398. Her contempt of
 women 400. The absurdity of
 mingling men and women in the
 same employments 401. Its moral
 bearing, the character of the man
 where it prevails 402. Her views
 of marriage and divorce exposed
 406. Ours is an astonishing age
 408. The tendency of Miss M's
 writings to infidelity 410. Her re-
 marks on "the first people of Bos-
 ton,"—her views in regard to mis-
 sions 411. On Dr. Beecher, reviv-
 als of religion, Miss Sedgwick,
 etc. 412. Loose views of the Sab-
 bath 413. Her censures of the
 American clergy 415. The Unitar-
 ian clergy 417.

Matthew's Gospel, inquiry into the
 original language of, and the gen-
 uineness of the first two chapters
 of the same, with particular refer-
 ence to Mr. Norton's view of these
 subjects 133. Introductory re-
 marks 133. Testimony of the
 christian fathers 135. Papias 136.
 Remarks concerning 137. His
 testimony a fair subject of investi-
 gation 140. The testimony of He-
 gesippus 141. Of Symmachus 142.
 The gospel according to the He-
 brews was interpolated and spuri-
 ous 144. Examples 147. Its re-
 semblance to the canonical Mat-
 thew 149. Its claims to canonical
 authority suspected by the ancient
 fathers 154. Evidence in favor of
 a Hebrew gospel of Matthew 158.
 Remarks on the same 159. Other
 circumstances which render the
 existence of an early genuine He-

brew Matthew improbable 163. Objections examined 170. Was not the gospel according to the Hebrews a translation from the Greek original of Matthew? 174. Conclusion 177.

The same subject continued. Introductory remarks 315. Positive evidence of the genuineness of Matthew I. II. 317. All the manuscript copies and ancient versions contain them 317. Always found in the Greek gospel. Quoted by Justin Martyr 319. Also by Celsus 324. Remarks on this evidence 326. Internal evidence of genuineness 327. Objections examined, viz. The gospel of the Ebionites did not contain it 330. The *Protevangelium* probably did not, etc. 331. Seeming contradictions, Mr. Norton's arguments considered 332. The genealogies given by Matthew and Luke compared 333. Other objections 339. The Magi 344. The star seen by them 345. Not a matter of *astrology* 350. Result of the preceding inquiries 353. Additional considerations 354.

Mayer, Lewis, D. D. on the scriptural idea of angels 356.

Medical philosophy, a popular treatise on. Notice of 239.

Meditations on the last days of Christ 496.

Missionary Schools 87. Extent of territory embraced by the Apostolical missions 88. State of Education in those countries 90. Schools and public libraries 92. Facts illustrative of the Apostolical missions 94. The gift of tongues 98. Circumstances of modern missions contrasted with those of the N. Test. 99. They are prosecuted in less civilized countries 100. Need extraneous influences 101. Intellectual degradation of the present heathen world 102. What place education should hold in the system of modern missions 107. The testimony of experience 108. A general rule in respect to their establishment 109. Should combine the college and the school of theology 110. The claims of education among the oriental churches 111.

Moeso-Gothic Language, the Version of Ulphilas 245. Original settlement of the North and Middle of Europe. Early history of the German, Teutonic or Gothic tribes 295. Appear first in history 19 years B. C. Their emigrations probably compulsory 297. A. D. 376, Moesia was assigned the Christian Goths as a residence. Their wars, etc. 299. The Version of the Bible by Ulphilas into Moeso-Gothic, the first specimen of German literature. Some account of Ulphilas 300. His invention of the Moeso-Gothic Alphabet. The runic letters in use from the remotest ages 301. The Goths acquainted with the Greek and Latin alphabets 303. The Version of Ulphilas proved to have been made from the Greek 305. The great value of this version asserted 306. Fragments of it only remain 307. Other relicts of the language, curious 309. Some account of the Germanic languages 310. A particular account of the Moeso-Gothic etc. 311.

Moral Obligation, Authority the source of 276.

Morrison Education Society 498.

Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch, Causes of the Denial of the 458.

N.

New York Bar, a member of on Presbyterianism 219.

New York Theological Seminary, Library of 253.

Nordheimer, Dr. I. A critical grammar of the Hebrew Language, notice of 247.

Nordheimer, Prof. I. on the Philosophy of Ecclesiastes 197.

Notices, Critical 238, 492.

O.

Obedience, active, of Christ, Views of the Early Reformers on 420. The position of Dr. Junkin and Mr. Barnes on this subject explained in a note 420. A belief in the imputation of Christ's active obedience not necessary to correct views of justification 421. The question unknown till after the

- death of Calvin 422. The language of the first reformers in unison with that of the primitive church 423. Testimony of Calvin 424. Of the Heidelberg Catechism 428. Of the venerable Ursinus 430. Piscator 431. The Belgic Confession 432. Dr. Pareus says the passive obedience alone is imputed to us 433. Dr. Amundus Polanus 434. Differs from Piscator with caution 435. Dr. Gomar agrees substantially 439. The Synod of Dort 440. Tilenus 441. Remarkable agreement. Wendeline 443. Pronounces that a horrible opinion which denies that the passive obedience is imputed to us 448. *Conclusion* 452. The views of the Reformers the same as those which are censured by some as heretical in the Presbyterian Church, etc. 454.
- Obligation, moral, authority a source of* 276.
- Organizations, Voluntary and Ecclesiastical, for benevolent objects* 257.
- Original Language of Matthew's Gospel, etc.* 133, 315.
- Oxford University* 511.
- P.
- Parker, Rev. Samuel, journal of an exploring tour beyond the Rocky Mountains, notice of* 250.
- Parsons's Biblical Analysis* 506.
- Pentateuch, causes of the denial of the Mosaic origin of the* 458. The tendency of the age to Naturalism 458. Opinions of De Wette on the Pentateuch 465. Theism giving place to pantheism 466. Efforts of Vatke 467. Strauss's Life of Jesus 468. Opinions on the decalogue 469. Further opinions of Strauss and Vatke 471. Principle of subjectivity 472. Errors of Reimarus and von Bohlen 473. Remark of Goethe illustrated, "as is the man, so is his God," 474. Denial of the genuineness of the Pentateuch aided by dislike to its principal personages 475. Incapacity of understanding the spirit of the Pentateuch 476. Stagnation of inquiry 477. De Wette, von Bohlen, Vatke, etc., deny the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch altogether 479. Eichhorn, Staadlin, and others, maintain the Mosaic origin of very important portions of the Pentateuch 479. Jahn's hypothesis does not meet the case 481. Bleek an able and candid writer 481. External evidence for the truth of the Bible too much overlooked 482. Others maintain the genuineness of the Pentateuch in its present form 483. Among these are Jahn, Hug, Movers, etc. 484. Views of Meyer, Bauer, Bertholdt, etc. 485. In the opinion of De Wette, the Pentateuch is poetry, except it is wanting in metre 486. Bauer and Vatke's opinion 488. Great variety of opinions on the relation of the different books to each other 489. Prospect for the future 490.
- Philips, Robert, life and times of George Whitefield, notice of* 248.
- Philosophy of Ecclesiastes* 197.
- Physical history of mankind by J. C. Prichard* 238.
- Phoenician language and writing* 492.
- Popular treatise on medical philosophy, notice of* 239.
- Pond, Rev. Enoch D. D. on Geology and revelation* 1.
- Presbyterian Church, state of presbyterianism a review of the leading measures of the General Assembly of 1837* 219. Remarks on the pamphlet by a member of the New York Bar. Its striking and seasonable appearance 220. Two bodies claiming to be the General Assembly 221. Previous character and position of the Presbyterian Church 222. Causes of present divisions 223. Sketch of the early history of the Presbyterian Church and its progress 225. Leading principles of its government 228. Resolutions of the General Assembly of 1837 examined 229. The plan of union 230. Remarks on 231. The declaration of the resolutions of 1837 absurd 233. The lawful constitution of the General Assembly of 1838 234. Concluding remarks 235.
- Probus, or Rome in the third century noticed* 494.

Q.

Quackery and imposture in medicine, an exposition of, by Dr. Ticknor, notice of 239.

R.

Reasons for the study of the Hebrew Language 113.

Red Sea 510.

Reformers, the early, Views of, on Faith and the Active obedience of Christ 179, 420.

Researches into the physical history of mankind by J. C. Prichard, notice of 238.

Rerelation, Geology, etc. 1.

Review of Miss Martineau's Works 389.

Robinson, Dr., Tour in Egypt and the Holy Land 510.

Rocky mountains, tour beyond, notice of 250.

S.

Sandemanianism 504.

Schauffler's Meditations noticed 496.

Schools, Missionary 87.

Schweighauser on the theology of Socrates 47.

Scriptural idea of Angels 356.

Sheppard, Rev. John, on Religion in France 497.

Sickness in the West Indies 496.

Sinai Mt. Robinson's visit at 511.

Socrates, the theology of 47.

Spring's Fragments 507.

Statistical Society of London 495.

Stearns, Rev. Samuel H. life and select discourses of, notice of 245.

Stuart, Prof. M. Inquiry respecting the original language of Matthew's Gospel, etc. 133, 315.

Study of the Hebrew language, reasons for the 113.

T.

Taylor, Mrs. Sarah Louisa, memoir of, noticed 253.

Theron and Aspasio, Letters on 504.

The Theology of Socrates. Preface 47. State of Theology among the Greeks. Poets and priests 48.

The older Grecian philosophers.

Anaxagoras 49. The Sophists 50.

Socrates' manner of teaching. The

character of his mind 52. The

way in which he came to the

knowledge of the true God, as intelligent 56. Omnipotent, good and wise 58. The goodness of God to all men 59. His care of individuals; divination, etc. 61. God is every where,—is invisible —is one 65. Necessity of divine worship 66. Outward and inward 67. Conclusion 69.

Ticknor, Caleb M. D. on medical philosophy and quackery, notice of 239.

Townsend's Chronological Arrangement 500.

Traffic in spirituous liquors 499.

Tyler, Prof. W. S. on the Analogies between Nature, Providence and Grace 22.

U.

Ulphilas, the version of, and the Moeso-Gothic language 295.

Universalism, weapons of, reversed 70.

Universalism brings against God the charge of partiality 71. Death of infants 71. Remorse 72. The righteous subjected to many sorrows 73. The most holy men persecuted 75. Men die in the very act of atrocious wickedness 76. Universalism charges God with incompetency 77. Conflicts with the benevolence of God 80.

V.

Van Ess Library 509.

Views of the Early Reformers on Justification, Faith and the active obedience of Christ: 179, 420.

Voluntary and Ecclesiastical Organizations for the promotion of benevolent objects 257. Some think that all objects of benevolence should be accomplished by the church, as a divinely organized body. But what do you mean by the church? 258. The word, church as here used, accurately defined, and difficulties suggested, etc. 259. The position that the scriptures authorize only one public association of men, the church, for benevolent objects, considered, 261. The existence of clashing sects, contrary to the word of God 262. Yet these together constitute the church of Christ, as it now is

263. The objection that a union of Christians of different denominations is of "*man's devising*" considered 263. Of those who maintain that the Bible authorizes only one association, etc. each sect acts by itself 264. To act ecclesiastically in all works of benevolence would be attended with special difficulties in New England 265. Formation of the A. B. C. F. M. 265. Responsibility of voluntary societies considered 266. The right of voluntary societies illustrated 267. Their necessity in New England urged 268. Expedient to leave the door open for different

modes 269. There should be no strife 270. The occasional abuse of the voluntary principle, no argument against the principle 272. Caution against innovations 273.

W.

Weapons of Universalism reversed 70. *Whitefield*, George, life and times of, notice of 248.

Wiseman, Nicholas D. D. on the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, notice of 243.

Woods, Rev. Leonard, D. D. remarks on Voluntary and Ecclesiastical organizations for benevolent objects 257.

ERRATA. Owing to the unavoidable absence of a person connected with the press, when two or three sheets were printed, a few errors crept in.—P. 34, 2d line from bottom, for *sufusoria* read *infusoria*; p. 35, 11th line from bottom, for *See* read *Sic*; for *sultis* read *actio*; 10th line from bottom, for *perfectis* read *perfectio*; 4th line from bottom, for *Infusonia* read *Infusoria*; bottom line, for *Ebsenberg* read *Ehrenberg*; p. 36, bottom line, for *Rodget* read *Roget*; p. 41, 14th line from bottom, for *evangelical* read *analogical*; p. 43, 6th line from bottom, for *Aorian* read *Aonian*; p. 255, middle of page, for *Garcen* read *Garcin*; p. 256, 9th line from bottom, for *Panthier* read *Pauthier*; p. 512, middle of page, for *Yafza* is probably meant *Jaffa*, though it is printed as it is written in the manuscript; (and so of some of the others;) line 19th from bottom, for *Hinnon* read *Hinnom*.

